

1488. c. 8
A N

A N S W E R

T O A N

ESSAY on SPIRIT:

Wherein is shewn,

That the Author's Interpretation of Scripture is imperfect; and his Representation of the Opinions of the antient Fathers, unfair.

By THOMAS KNOWLES, M. A.

Chaplain to the Right Honourable the Lady HERVEY.

L O N D O N:

Printed for C. BATHURST at the *Cross-Keys* in *Fleetstreet*; and sold by Mr. THIRLBURN at *Cambridge*, Mr. PARKER at *Oxford*, and by Mrs. WATSON and Mrs. ROGERS at *Bury*.

MDCCLIII.

[Price Eighteen-Pence.]

MA

ALSWER

MAOT

ESSAY ON THE



OF THE

OF THE

TO

The Most REVEREND

His GRACE

The Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*,

PRIMATE of all *ENGLAND*,

And METROPOLITAN,

This ANSWER

TO AN

ESSAY on SPIRIT

Is, by Permission,

Humbly Dedicated and Inscribed,

By his GRACE'S

most dutiful,

and obedient Servant,

Thomas Knowles.

TO

THE REV. FATHER

THE CLOVE

The Lord Bishop of Ceylon

TRINITY COLLEGE, SINGAPORE

And MESSRS. ROBERTSON

THE SINGAPORE

PRINTERS

10, ROBINSON ROAD

1881

THE SINGAPORE

PRINTERS

10, ROBINSON ROAD

1881

THE SINGAPORE

A N
A N S W E R
T O A N
E S S A Y on S P I R I T.

TH A T God is to be worshipped is the first principle of natural Religion; and that he is to be worshipped *in spirit and in truth*, is the chief initiating article of Christianity. In whatever *manner* therefore it is judged most proper, that this service should be performed, with that we are in duty bound to comply, both in inward sincerity and outward behaviour: otherwise the condemnation pronounced against the *Jews* will be strictly applicable to ourselves, *This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me;* and the sentence will be equally just, *But in vain do they worship me.* A Clergyman, for example, to whom is enjoined the constant use of the *Common-Prayer*, in the presence of God, and as the solemn duty of the Sanctuary, ought

to be, at all times, as ready and prepared to give his *unfeigned assent* to the truth and equity of every thing contained in that mode of worship, with which he ventures to approach the throne of Grace, as he is willing to justify himself in the *use* of it: otherwise, he seems to betray the reasonableness and necessity of the *Form* itself, and, I am afraid, by thus equivocating with his own conscience, he turns the public worship of God into a solemn piece of mockery.

I do not mean, that either the Liturgy of the church of England, or any other human composition can be so thoroughly perfect, as to admit of no alteration for the better; or, that, as our Saviour goes on, we should *teach for doctrines the commandments of men*: but this I may venture to affirm, that no man ought to repeat publicly any doctrines of Faith, as the Articles of his belief, the truth of which he will not defend, nor believes. Indeed, the author of *an Essay on Spirit*, has consider'd this matter in a very different light:

“ he can see no manner of impropriety in
 “ the legislative power of any Society insist-
 “ ing upon such a kind of Subscription, as
 “ is only required to be made for peace-
 “ sake, and the preservation of the outward
 “ forms

“ forms of society:” *Ded. p.* 8, 9. and perhaps in indifferent things, this latitude of thought and subscription may innocently be allowed: but a man must have a very low opinion of the Articles of the Christian Faith, who is ready to join with any communion in subscribing to those Articles merely for peace and quietness: in this view, Religion wou’d become subservient to men’s own humours and settlements; and instead of being the foundation of society, the accidental forms of society wou’d be made the strongest fancies of Religion and public worship. But “ a man under these circumstances may, for “ prudential reasons, honestly subscribe and “ submit to the use of one established form, “ though he, in his own private opinion, “ may think another to be better:” *Ded. p.* 9. What prudential reasons can be of equal weight with sincerity of affection in the sight of God, I know not; but I am afraid, his argument will carry him too far for a Christian to comply with; for another man may tell us, that for some *prudential reasons* he will join with the Protestant church in the use of the Sacrament, and in eating the bread and drinking the cup, but in his heart he believes, that the bread and wine are the

real body and blood of Christ, which he receives under those *accidents* of bread and wine: and thus our subscriptions, which ought to be founded on sincerity and truth, will be so vaguely understood, as to be made consistent, in the opinion of some men, with all the *pious frauds* and *impious deceits* of the church of *Rome*.

Nor are even the Forms of religious worship so insignificant in themselves, as that it shou'd be quite indifferent, whether we join in communion with one mode or another. For example, those gestures, which will best express our awe and reverence of God ought by all means to be retained in the service of him; and those, which in common apprehension are void of outward respect, or fix no impressions of reverence at all on the minds of the worshippers, ought to be rejected, as unbecoming the work of the Sanctuary: and therefore no man can honestly submit *to the use* of such a luke-warm address to God, without some disregard shewn to his majesty and service. It is the reasoning of God himself upon another occasion, applicable in like manner to this; *offer it unto thy Governor, will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person?* (*Mal. i. 8.*) would an humble petitioner
address

address his earthly Sovereign upon his seat, or upon his bended knee? and if an indifferency of behaviour would be condemned, as indecent and improper, in the presence of an earthly King; how can we think it an indifferent matter, in what posture of respect or disrespect we accost the *King of kings, and Lord of lords?*

But our author has recourse, in his own justification, to the Act itself, by which we are bound: he tells us, “ that the purport
“ and intent of the Act is, that this declara-
“ tion of assent shou’d be only *to the use of*
“ those things which are contained in the
“ book of Common-Prayer, which is very
“ different from assenting to the things them-
“ selves.” *page 12.* Now, whoever examines the Act, will, I believe, find, that *both* are required by it: in one part of it, we are enjoined a declaration of our unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing *contained in*, as well as *prescribed by* the book of Common-Prayer; which is certainly a declaration of a man’s own opinion, and not barely an engagement to peace and conformity: for besides this, in another part we are commanded to promise and declare our conformity to the Liturgy of the church of England,
which

which would be but a tautological injunction of the same thing, if no more were meant by the former declaration, than an assent to the use of the Common-Prayer, which is the design of the latter. And that something more than this has always been understood by it, is evident from what our author himself observes, "that some of the most learned and conscientious persons among the Dissenters have made the form of our declaration, an objection, if not the principal one, against coming into our church," p. 16. Take away this barrier, and when the Declaration is thus warped, make it an indifferent thing, whether we use this form or another, even tho' we think another better, and then we shall be *in utrumque parati*, ready to join in communion with the church of England or the church of Scotland, according as *prudential reasons* shall lead us. A coalition, so long wished for, might be very easily brought about by these means, if we will give up the necessity of any difference that subsists between us, and are willing to build our church upon the foundation, which the Dissenters themselves shall lay for us.

Our author has plainly something further in view, than barely the use of the Liturgy

turgy of the church of England: he seems to think it very unjust, that those who do not approve of all the Articles of the established Religion, or attempt to find fault with them, should be looked upon immediately as disturbers of the peace of the church, and loaded with the opprobrious names of *Schismatic* or *Heretic*, p. 18. The original intent and design of the compilers of the Articles was, to remove *those diversities of opinions*, which men, left to their own imaginations, might broach in matters of faith; and, as far as they were able, to *establish* a general consent touching true Religion: the very title therefore of this body of Laws is sufficient to justify us in pronouncing them to be *Schismatics*, who, whilst they profess the same Religion and faith, would lead us to disagreeing constructions of the particular doctrines of that faith. By the fifth Canon of our church, all those are to be excommunicated *ipso facto*, who shall affirm any of the Articles to be *erroneous*: and by the 36th, every Clergyman is required to subscribe to them *willingly*, and *ex animo*; and to acknowledge all and every Article to be agreeable to the word of God: whoever therefore endeavours to unsettle the minds of the people in
this

this respect infringes upon the peace, and, in some measure, subverts the orders of the church, which is *Schism* itself: and whoever attempts to find fault with the doctrines, that are taught therein, is guilty of *Heresy*, not because he runs counter to the *established* form, but because that form of doctrine, which he contradicts and opposes, is founded upon the *sure word of Prophecy*.

For this indeed seems to be the true meaning of the word, *Heresy*, although this author, to avoid any bad imputation, would put a more favourable construction upon it. He first lays it down as an undoubted truth, that “ the established Religion of every country
“ is that which constitutes *Orthodoxy* ;” and therefore, “ that they who differ and separate therefrom are generally called *Hereticks* :” p. 23, 24. But I rather imagine, that by *Orthodoxy* is meant, the profession of those principles of faith and doctrine, which are founded upon the received and most obvious sense of the holy Scriptures, agreeably to the apostolical and primitive interpretations of them ; and that *Heresy* is an opposition to those principles, not because they are received by any particular church, but because they have their authority and sanction from the *written word of God*. And

And this sense of the word will be found agreeable also to the true sense of the texts of scripture which he quotes upon this occasion. " St. Paul, in his apology to Felix, " said, *This I confess, that after the way " which they call Heresy, so worship I the " God of my Fathers,*" *Acts* xxiv. 5, 14. from whence our author would infer, p. 24. that the Christian Religion was therefore called *Heresy*, " because the Christians separated from " the Jewish, which was the established Religion of the country." But St. Paul goes on, and explains wherein this *Heresy*, with which he was charged, consisted; and that was, in believing and professing the great fundamental article of the Christian Faith, *that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.* (*Acts* xxiv. 14, 15.) This was not a persuasion about any indifferent matter, which might or might not correspond with the truth of Scripture; but the Jews therefore stigmatized him with the name of *Heretic*, because he seemed to them to be a setter forth of strange Gods; preaching unto them Jesus and the Resurrection: *Acts* xvii. 18. Doctrines, which they looked upon as directly opposite to those Scriptures, which they had hitherto embraced. They did not believe

believe that their Prophecies were fulfilled in the person of the *Messiah*; and therefore pronounced that to be *Heresy*, which they imagined to be a false pretension to the completion of those Prophecies. Dr. *Stebbing* has set this matter in a clear light in his *second letter to Mr. Foster*, p. 14. “*After the way, which they call Heresy, &c.* Is not this declaring, that he followed a different way, or was of a different sect from the *Jews*? Yet he denies, in effect, that his *way* was *Heresy*: In what sense? why plainly, as *Heresy* stood *opposed* to God’s true *worship*, as contained in the Law and the Prophets.”

I am aware of a common objection to this way of reasoning, which our author will not fail to make use of; *viz.* that men of all persuasions will produce texts of Scripture to support their own opinions; and therefore, even in this light, “it is possible that an Heretic may be in the right.” p. 25. But to this I answer; the same Scripture cannot strictly and properly be understood to favour two contrary opinions; so that some rules must be observed in the interpretation of Scripture, which may determine the sense of it either way, and serve to point out on which side the imputation of Heresy and falshood ought to be

be fixed. Now the best rules for this purpose, are, to examine the whole context; to observe the connexion with what goes before and after; and to consider the agreement or disagreement of the interpretation, thus collected, with our ideas of God and his Attributes: "whoever guides himself, and steers by this compass can never err much: but whoever suffers himself to be led away by the appearance of some more obscure phrases in the expressions of Scripture, and the glosses of men upon them, without regard to these rules, may run into the greatest delusions, may wander eternally, and lose himself in one mistake after another." (Archbp. Tillotson's *Serm.* 115.) If men will be *wise above what is written*, or, will select only parts of sentences, in order to confirm their own private opinions, they may wrest both Scripture and any other writing to countenance any the most contradictory tenets: nay, I will venture to affirm, that by this unfair method of interpreting, the *Arian Heretic*, and the *orthodox Trinitarian* may produce the very same passage for a proof of their opposite principles. *Colossians* i. 15, 16. is a remarkable one to this purpose; the Arian will prove from the former verse, taken singly, *the first-born*

born of every creature, that Jesus Christ is a creature; whilst the true Believer of Christ's Divinity, taking the whole context together, will fairly draw this into an argument for the contrary, because the reason of the expression is explained in the next verse, *for by him were all things created*. It should therefore properly be translated, *First-born before the whole creation*; for he is so called, because he is *before all things*, and because *by him were all things created*; consequently, he was himself *uncreated*, and as such, existing with the Father from all eternity*. From this one instance out of many, we may observe, that *Heresy* has arisen from misunderstanding the Scriptures, or imperfectly explaining them; and that therefore it is not only not possible, contrary to what our author asserts, "that
" an Heretic may be in the right;" but certain, that he must be in the wrong.

The scripture sense of the word *Heretic* will confirm this assertion: it is indeed used

* This interpretation of the passage is supported by the authority of *Athanasius*, Orat. 2. contr. Arian. p. 530; and of *Eusebius*, who connects the two verses in the same manner, in his Dem. Evang. lib. 5. p. 213. *Justin Martyr* too gives the same proof of Christ's Divinity, *ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τῆς εἶναι τέχνην πρωτότοκον τῶν ὅλων κτισμάτων, ὑπεπροφύτευτο*. Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 354.

but

but once in the whole new Testament, and there in a bad sense. The learned *Pasor*, who perfectly understood the signification of Scripture-phrases, explains it to be one, *qui novas sibi fingit & eligit opiniones cum fundamento salutis pugnantes, easque mordicus defendit*: in *Tit.* iii. 10. An opposition therefore to the articles and terms of salvation is included in the very notion of the word *Heretic*; and he is said by St. *Paul* to be *self-condemned*, not, as our author argues, because of his being admonished and yet persevering in his opposition to the church; but (as Dr. *Stebbing* has well observed) because he declares openly his departure from the *true Faith*, and publishes that offence, for which the Church adjudges him worthy to be rejected.

Because St. *Paul* directs *Titus* to *admonish an Heretic* before he *rejects him*, our author infers from it, that the “crime of *Heresy*” consists in an error of the will, rather than “of the judgment.” p. 28. but who can be the proper judge of this? if the Apostles knew the hearts of men, and could tell whether their opposition to the Faith was from conscience or not, yet all men have not this faculty of discerning. A man may form a wrong judgment of an Article of Faith, and

B

may

may conscientiously persist in his own opinion, and yet may be an *Heretic* in the true sense of the word: his judgment will, in such a case, influence his will, and the sentence of the Church will lye against him, whether his profession be sincere or not: for God only can know the motives of his persevering in error; his opposition to the Truth is still manifest, and to be punished accordingly.

Nor is it perseverance alone in error that constitutes the crime of *Heresy*, as our author wou'd insinuate, p. 39. for an *Heretic* was to be admonished upon the first publishing of his principles; and therefore deserved the punishment, as well as the character of an *Heretic*, because (according to the definition of *Hesychius*) *he had chosen some other opinion, besides, or, in opposition to the truth*: and his self-condemnation followed from his executing that sentence of rejection upon himself, which the ruler of the Church had a right to execute, when he found him, upon examination, to be irreclaimable. If there had not been some crime in his "conceiving of error," as well as in "the prosecuting and persevering in it," the Apostle would not have ordered that he should be admonished at all; and if admonition would not serve to
work

work in him a repentance of his crime, the punishment that was due to it was to be inflicted, but not till after a fair warning.

But our author seems to have been led into this opinion by the construction, which he puts upon a passage in St. *Athanasius*; *Quest.* 38. *Πόθεν λέγεται αἵρεσις*; —unde dicitur *Hæresis*? Resp. Ἀπὸ τῆς αἰρεῖσθαι τι ἰδίον, καὶ τῆτο ἐξακολουθεῖν, *ab eo, si quis eligat & exequatur* (or as our author translates it, *ab eligendo & proseguendo*) *sententiam suam privatam & propriam.* p. 39. Now, if we examine the sense, which this Father generally puts upon the word *Heresy*, we shall find, that he did not consider it in such an indefinite light, as our author wou'd understand him. In his second Oration against the *Arians*, he lays it down as a general rule, that *all Heresies are contrary to the Truth*, Vol. I. p. 306. and in his Disputation against *Arius*, he calls that man an *Heretic*, *qui prisca Apostolicæ fidei fundamenta afferens, ipse sibi præ suæ voluntatis arbitrio fidem, quam sequi debeat, somniat.* p. 604. by comparing these different expressions of the same writer, I think it may be fairly concluded, that he did not intend to lay the greatest stress of the crime of *Heresy* upon “the prosecuting and persevering in it,” but upon a man's setting

up, τὸ ἴδιον, his own private opinion in opposition to the Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints.

But though the authority of Athanasius be of some weight, when he seems to favour our author's own sentiments, yet his writings are to be looked upon as unintelligible, and improper to be read when they make against him. The Creed, in particular, which goes under his name, gives him great offence, "because it is a Theologico-metaphysical dispute, which few, if any, of the Learned understand; but is undoubtedly above the capacity of the vulgar:" or, even if it were perfectly understood by all, yet he can see no reason, "why the members of the Church of Ireland should be tied down to assent to the compositions of a private person."

P. 54, 55. To this charge it may be answered, that the principal doctrine of Faith, which is advanced in, and which is principally objected to this Creed, is, the *Unity in Trinity*, and the *Trinity in Unity*, which, however differently expressed, is no more than what St. John also asserts, *There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one*: but as to the particular method

thod of his explaining this Doctrine, it is no farther to be assented to by us, than as it corresponds with that general Truth, founded upon the sense of the Scriptures themselves: and surely, there can be no hurt in giving our assent to those compositions, the fundamentals of which are warranted by the Gospel, and the explanations of them are agreeable to the written word of God. "The common people, says Mr. *Seed*, have nothing to do with minute appendages and technical terms, which were designed as so many fences against metaphysical subtilties, and artful evasions. The Creed is only the common Doctrine of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* guarded; and they who believe those fundamental Articles, virtually believe every thing else, which was put in to save and secure those fundamental Articles." *Postb. Serm.* Vol. I. Serm. 5. And agreeably to this, *Ludolphus Saxo*, the Carthusian, calls the Athanasian Creed the *guard* or *defence* against Heresies.

However, that no consideration may be omitted, which might incline the Ruling powers of the Church to discard this Creed, he adds, "it is now universally acknowledged among the Learned, that it was originally a spurious production, imposed upon the

“ world under the name of *Athanasius*, till
“ detected by the Criticisms of the learned
“ *Vossius*.” p. 55. But what are these, I may
call them *modern Criticisms*, when set against
the testimonies of those, who lived in the
ages next to this primitive Father? Archbi-
shop *Usher* with good reason supposes, that
a council of *Spain*, held in 447, was ac-
quainted with this Creed, and borrowed some
expressions from it; which will not agree
very well with the opinion of the latest Cri-
tics, who ascribe it to a latin author, *Vigilius*
Tapsensis, an African Bishop, who lived in
the latter end of the fifth Century; much
less will it agree with Bishop *Burnet*’s obser-
vation, that it was never heard of before the
eighth Century: (*Expos. of the Art.* p. 108.)
The learned *Bingham* also, in his Antiquities,
speaks of a council held at *Autun*, in the next
Century after *Athanasius*’s time, which not
only mentioned the Creed under the name of
Athanasius, but ordered every Presbyter, Dea-
con, and Subdeacon to read it together with
the *Apostle’s Creed*, or to be liable to the Bi-
shop’s censure for his omission. Which implies,
says Mr. *Bingham*, that it was then esteemed
the genuine work of *Athanasius*, and as such,
had for some time been received in the Church.

Antiq.

Antiq. Vol. IV. p. 120. And what is yet more remarkable, *Gregory Nazianzen*, who was born about the time of the great *Nicene* council, says, that this Creed was both in the east and west Churches accepted as a treasure of inestimable price: his words are, Ταύτην μοι δοκῶσιν αἰδέμενος τὴν ὁμολογίαν οἱ τε τῆς ἐσπερίας, καὶ τῆς εἰώας ὅσον βιώσιμον: (*De Athanas.*) And if the Antients held this Creed in such high repute, the reason which *Hooker* gives will more strongly justify our use of it: "These catholic declarations of our belief delivered by them which were so much nearer than we are unto the first publication thereof, and continuing needful for all men at all times to know, these confessions as testimonies of our continuance in the same Faith to this present day, we rather use than any other gloss or paraphrase devised by ourselves, which tho' it were to the same effect, notwithstanding could not be of the like authority and credit:" *Eccles. Polity*, Book V. And we still continue to receive and believe this, as well as the other Creeds, agreeably to the injunction and reason of the Article of our Church, because it may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Writ. "And the condemning clauses are to be understood as relating only to those

who obstinately deny the substance of the Christian Faith;" as the Rubric, settled in 1689, is worded.

These reflections upon the primitive Father are purposely dwelt upon in the *Dedication* to pave the way for those more dangerous principles, advanced in the *Essay* itself; for his opposition to which St. *Athanasius* suffered the greatest cruelties, that an enraged party could inflict, but which, after his example, it is the duty of every good Christian strenuously to discountenance and oppose. Our author begins with the first rudiments of metaphysical knowledge, and proceeds gradually in a train of reasoning upon the nature and extent of the human faculties, little liable to any exceptions, unless in those parts, where he would hint at some preliminaries, that might afterwards serve to improve and support his main doctrine: such is the insinuation, p. 5. that "every creature that
" exists, beside the *first Cause*, which way so-
" ever it is brought forth into being, whe-
" ther it be *begotten, emanated, created, or*
" *spoken forth*, it must proceed from, and owe
" its existence to the Will, as well as Power
" of that first Cause." This is certainly true of all temporary visible effects, for they are
created,

created, and therefore dependent on the will of him who created them; but the distant conclusion artfully couched under these words will by no means hold good; and that is, that the eternal spirit of Christ is also created, and therefore in the same manner dependent. Indeed, he is sometimes called the *begotten Son of God*; but then, by way of distinction, he is emphatically styled, as none other can be, the *ONLY begotten*: of the same substance with the Father in the Divine Unity, and therefore no farther dependent on his Will, than as he partakes of his Nature; and that is, only as the alliance and relation of Son implies, in our conceptions, a proper Generation from the same individual substance of the Father. He is always represented as the creator of all other emanations visible and invisible; consequently himself must be uncreated, and as such, not dependent on any other power.

Besides, whatever in the ordinary course of Nature, owes its existence to the Will of another, as the words themselves imply, must be posterior to him in beginning, and therefore once was not: but, as St. *Basil* argues against *Eunomius*, “ will you not cease to speak of *his* not existing, who exists necessarily, who is the Fountain of life; who gave Being to
the

the things that are?" *Basil* contr. *Eun.* 2. p. 56. And again, p. 57. speaking of the *Eunomians*, he says, "they blaspheme in saying the *Son of God* ever was not, as if he did not exist by his own nature, but was brought into Being by the favour of God:" and what less than this is distantly intended by our author's general insinuation?

Further—the dependence of creatures arises from the imperfection of Mortality; but since *St. Paul* calls Christ, *God blessed for ever*, this imperfection cannot be any way applicable to him, who together with his Father, *inhabiteth eternity*. For God communicated his Divinity to the Son, as Son of God, and therefore he communicated it without beginning: αἰὲν θεός, αἰὲν υἱός; ἅμα πατήρ, ἅμα υἱός, as *St. Athanasius* words it: He was always a Son, because always God; even as the Father was always Father, because always God*.

This communication of the Divine essence our author allows, and as it serves his purpose, extends the possibility of it even to many parts of the creation, in the greatest measure. "A man, says he, of the greatest abilities
" may, for want of faculties, be unable to

* *Vid.* Bp. *Pearson* on the Creed. p. 137.

" conceive

“ conceive that Power, whereby a created in-
 “ telligent Agent, of superior qualifications
 “ to those communicated to Mankind, can
 “ be enabled to see in darkness as well as
 “ light; to know the inmost recesses and
 “ thoughts of men’s hearts; to preside at
 “ once over such a world as this which we
 “ inhabit, and where two or three are ga-
 “ thered together, there to be also invisible
 “ in the midst of them: and yet such a
 “ Power may certainly be communicated,
 “ because it implies no contradiction.” p. 26,

27. It implies a contradiction to suppose that these qualifications can be lodged in any *created Agent*; for they belong to Divinity itself. To *search the heart* is the Scripture-characteristic of God only: to *preside over a world*, is the act of Providence alone: and to *be every where in the midst of two or three gathered together*, is nothing less than Omnipresence and Omnipotence. And can created, and as such imperfect, Beings partake of these perfections? as well might we talk of a creation without a beginning, as of a creature all perfect in its properties. But this observation also has a tendency to the same point with the foregoing: for if we should grant that these perfections or properties may be communicated

to a *created Agent*, the use he will make of the concession is, that *Jesus Christ*, to whom they are attributed, may be such a *created Agent*. The Argument begins where it ought to end: this his *creation* should have been first proved, and then such a communication of divine Attributes, as is here maintained, might have been judged possible by the faculties of Mankind.

But further—the creation of this world is, in Scripture, ascribed to God the Son: and that this may not interfere with the opinion, hereafter to be established, that *Jesus Christ* himself is a *created Being*, our author prepares us for it by “supposing that God might communicate so much power to one of his own creatures, of a more exalted nature than man, as to enable him to create inferior Beings, and frame a world of his own, composed of intelligent Agents: which power however must be *limited*, and must be *dependent* on the supreme Being.” p. 27. But this happens to be a contradiction in terms: for the power of creating must be infinite, and therefore unlimited and independent, since nothing can resist it: nothing from without, by the very supposition, nor from within, but his own will. The similitude,
“ of

“ of building houses, and making clocks and
“ watches,” is nothing to the purpose : in these
cases, the materials are already made, and the
hand of the Artificer only models them at
will : but to bring something out of nothing
requires an Almighty power : nor could
Christ have been said to do it, but by the com-
munication of that Omnipresence, which no
created Being is capable either of receiving or
exerting : it is *God* alone, *who can speak, and*
it is done ; who can command, and it is created.

After these and some more general obser-
vations on the nature and difference of created
Spirits, we are led on to the opinion of the
Jews concerning the ministry of Angels. The
government of this lower world, he says, was
constantly attributed to their care ; and the ma-
nagement of more extraordinary events was
“ committed to the care of the first-born of
God, the *Logos*, the secondary essence, who
is, by *Philo*, very justly called the Archangel
with many names.” p. 44, 45. And to prove
that these sentiments were properly as well as
universally received among the Jews, he col-
lects the justness of them from a comparison
of two passages in the old Testament, which,
he thinks, illustrate and confirm each other.
The one is in *Daniel*, where he calleth *Mi-
chael*,

chael, the great Prince which standeth for the children of Israel. ch. xii. 1. and the other is in *Deuteronomy*, where it is said, that *the Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance*; or, as our author translates it, *the Lord's portion is his people Jacob, the line of his inheritance Israel*: chap. xxxii. 9. "Whence
 " it is manifest, says he, that one Angel, in
 " particular, who is called, by *Moses*, *Jehovah*, and by the Septuagint is translated, *the*
 " *Lord*, had Israel assigned to him by the
 " *Most High*, as the portion of his inheritance; and therefore may very reasonably
 " be supposed to be the same person with
 " that *first Prince*, mentioned by *Daniel*,
 " whom he also calleth *Michael, the great*
 " *Prince which standeth for the children of Israel.*" p. 47, 48.

Now if we examine these two passages by themselves we shall find, that they have not the least connexion with each other; but that the one refers to a matter of fact, already past, and the other is a prophetic allusion to what was to come. The xxxiid chapter of *Deuteronomy* contains *Moses's* last affectionate speech to the children of *Israel*, commonly called *Moses's* song, in which he first exhorts them
 to

to obedience by the consideration of the perfection of God's works, and the equity of his judgments, (*ver. 4.*) and then upbraids them with their own disobedience, upon the principles of gratitude, arising from the many obligations, that God had laid upon them, (*ver. 6, 7.*) discovering a very particular regard for them even in the early days of their fore-father *Abraham*: for *when he separated the sons of Adam, after the flood, he set the bounds of the people, according to the number of the children of Israel*, that there might be room left for the convenient habitation of a numerous people, which, in his wisdom, he knew would arise to take possession of that country, *ver. 8.* And as if this were not sufficient for them, *Moses* reminds them that God had chosen *them* alone out of all the *nations of the world*, to be under his immediate care, and to enjoy privileges and blessings, which none other nation ever enjoyed; *for the Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance*; (*ver. 9.*) and to prevent the supposition, of any foreign help, he adds, *the Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange God with him*; (*ver. 12.*) the same which the Psalmist also observes, *the Lord hath chosen Jacob unto himself, and Israel*
for

for his peculiar treasure, or as it is in the other version, *for his own possession*. Psal. cxxxv. 4. And accordingly, when Jeremiah draws the unequal comparison between the supreme God and the Idols of the Heathens, he distinguishes the Most High by the same character, *the portion of Jacob is not like them: for he is the Former of all things, and Israel is the rod (or sceptre, or tribe) of his inheritance; the Lord of Hosts is his name*. Jer. x. 16. This seems to be the full meaning of the Jewish Lawgiver, without any relation to the second person in the Godhead, or indeed, without any reference to another Governor, besides the great God of Heaven and earth, whom the Jews had ungratefully forgot, whilst they were partaking of the benefits of his special Providence.

The prophecy of *Daniel* is as foreign to this purpose as can well be imagined. The xth, xith, and xiith chapters contain the prophetic successions of the *Persian* and *Grecian* Monarchies: He foretels the difficulties that these Nations would throw in the way of the *Jews* against their endeavours to rebuild the Temple; and that in the time of the *Maccabees* in particular, *Antiochus* would abolish their sacrifices, and profane their Temple, by setting up an Idol

Idol in it; (called *the abomination that maketh desolate*;) but in the midst of these distresses, he comforts them with the promise of the divine protection, which would be sufficient to defeat the impious attempts of the enemies of their Religion, and deliver the worshippers of the true God, whilst his *indignation was accomplished* in the destruction of the *setters up* of false Gods.

Commentators indeed have observed, that the account, which *Daniel* gives of the persecutor *Antiochus* is exactly similar to the description of Anti-christ in the new Testament, as Type and Anti-type: And if this be allowed, *Grotius's* hint will, in all reason, hold good, that the Guardian Angel of the Jews, here called *Michael*, may be looked upon as a Type, but a Type only, of our great deliverer *Jesus Christ*; the same destruction being threaten'd to the professors of both Religions, and the same protection from Idolatrous insults being promised to both: but this should be more than a Type of Christ's distant Kingdom, or that this his interposition in behalf of the Church should commence before his own ministry begun, is not very reasonable to suppose; since it would then appear, that he once acted upon earth in support of a Religion,

C

which

which he came down upon earth purposely to abolish. Nor will it any more follow from one part of the supposition, of *Michael's* being a Type of Christ, that therefore Christ himself appeared in favour of the Jews, than it will from the other part, that *Antiochus* was that very Anti-Christ who again appeared in the time of Christianity in opposition to the progress of it. Upon the whole however it is very evident, that the passage in *Deuteronomy* relates to temporal blessings, which the Jews had already received from the *particular Providence of God*; and that this in *Daniel* was prophetic of future deliverances, which, in a spiritual view, would preserve their Religion by the *ministry of Angels*. This was accordingly fulfilled, and the several Monarchies, which were to succeed one another, were also, as *Rollin* remarks, “ successively destroyed by each other, and gave place to the eternal empire of *Jesus Christ*, for whom alone they had subsisted.”

The construction, which our author puts upon the text in *Daniel* is originally *Junius's*, who supplies him also with another argument in defence of it. “ And what is remarkable, “ is this, that this name of *Michael*, which “ is given by *Daniel* to this Archangel, literally
“ terally

“terally signifies, *who is like God*,” p. 48. or rather, interrogatively, *Quis sicut Deus? vel, tanquam Deus fortis?* says *Willetus*. And what so natural, as to call that *ministring Angel*, by whom God intended to make his *power to be known*, by a name, which denoted the greatness and efficacy of that power? * This would convey the strongest assurance of safety and protection to the *Jews*, when they were reminded, that none was equal to their deliverer in strength: but to infer from hence, that this deputed Guardian must therefore be a partaker of the Godhead, is as absurd, as to affirm, from the like affinity of names, that *Joshua*, who is otherwise called *Jesus*, was also that same *Jesus*, the Son of God, who, as *St. Matthew* interprets it, *shall save his people from their sins*.

Immediately after this observation, the testimony of *Philo* is occasionally introduced, who calls this Archangel the *Image of God*; and this Image the *Logos* and the second God. This

* What might most probably give rise to the opinion of Michael's being the Guardian Angel of the Jews, is what *Bp. Patrick* has observed on *Exod. xxiii. ver. 23. My Angel shall go before thee*] The word *Malachi*, *my Angel*, consisting of the very same letters with *Michael*, the author of *Baal Hatturim* takes it, as if he had said, *Michael*, *my proper or peculiar Angel*, &c. *Patrick's Comment*.

quotation our author makes use of only to lead him to the mention of a passage in the Apocryphal *book of Wisdom*, which, he thinks, confirms his opinion, that the person, emphatically called *the Word*, in the new Testament, acts in the capacity, and under the appellation of an *Angel*, in the old. “ This
 “ *Logos*, or *Word*, says he, is, in the *book of*
 “ *Wisdom*, manifestly spoken of, as the Guar-
 “ dian Angel of *Israel*; where the author of
 “ that elegant work, in describing the Angel,
 “ who was sent to rescue them from their E-
 “ gyptian bondage, by destroying the First-
 “ born of the *Egyptians*, says; For while all
 “ things were in quiet silence, and that night
 “ was in the midst of her swift course, thine Al-
 “ mighty WORD leapt down from Heaven, out
 “ of thy royal Throne, as a fierce man of war
 “ into the midst of a land of destruction, and
 “ brought thy unfeigned Commandment, as a
 “ sharp sword, and standing up, filled all things
 “ with death, and it touched the Heaven, but
 “ it stood upon the Earth.” (*Wisd.* xviii. 13,
 16.) And in the margin, p. 49. he refers to the Text in *Exodus*, chap. xxiii. 20. to which the Apocryphal writer alludes, where it is promised to the *Israelites*, Behold, I send an Angel before thee to keep thee in the way——be-
 ware

ware of him, and obey his voice——for my name is in him. “ And therefore also, our author “ goes on, the *Jerusalem Targum* on *Exod.* xii. “ 23. where it is said in the *Hebrew*, *And Jehovah will pass through to smite the Egyptians*, paraphrases it by saying, *And the Word of Jehovah shall pass through to smite the Egyptians.*” p. 49.

Now it is most likely that the author of the *book of Wisdom* did not intend to express the *action* itself of the destroying Angel by, *thine Almighty Word leapt down*; and it is most probable too, that *Moses* meant to resolve this work of destroying the Egyptians into the agency of a Being, very different in nature from that Angel of Providence, who was to *keep them in the way, and to bring them into the place which God had prepared*. If these two points can be proved, it will then follow, that no application can be made of these passages to the subject in hand.

And first, The author of the *book of Wisdom* did not intend to express the *action* itself of the destroying Angel, but only figuratively, the divine *command* issued out from the throne of God to execute his vengeance upon the enemies of his people. The description will agree very well with this supposition:

tion: from his *Royal Throne* God's authority was shewn: his *unfeigned Commandment* of destruction was the Law of his mouth: and the equity of it consisted in that supreme dominion, which God has over universal nature, presiding over both the Heaven and the Earth; signified by that sublime picture, *it touched the Heaven, but it stood upon the Earth.**

Bishop Bull justly condemns Grotius for applying these words to a created Angel, because of the expressions, *Almighty, Royal throne in Heaven, and while it stood upon earth, it touched the Heaven*, but apply them to universal Providence, which supports and governs all things by his word, and is often in Scripture represented as sitting on a Throne, and commanding the instruments of his power from thence, and we need not introduce the *Mediator of the new Covenant*, in this action, nor leave room for a conjecture, that he may be one of those created Angels who were often employed in the administration of the affairs of the *Jews* under the old Testament.

Bishop Patrick's exposition of *Exod. xxiii. 21.* which our author refers us to in the margin, will also confirm this sense of the *Apocry-*

* In allusion probably to the chain of the Antients, by which they expressed their opinion of the governing Providence of their supreme God.

phal writer. Obey his voice : i. e. Because he did but report what God himself commanded ; who was there present with them, as long as they obliged him.——*For my name is in him*, i. e. He acts by my authority and power. *Maimonides* expounds it, *my word is in him* ; i. e. says he, God's will and pleasure was declared by the Angel. In which he seems to follow the *Chaldee*, who translates it, *for his word is in my name* ; i. e. what he speaks is by my authority. *Patrick's* Comment.

But 2dly *Moses* might most probably mean to resolve this work of destroying the Egyptians into the immediate agency of a Being very different in nature from that Angel of Providence, who was to *keep them in the way*, and to *bring them into the place which God had prepared*. For if we lay any stress upon *David's* account of this matter, we shall rather be inclined to believe, that it was an *evil Angel*, who performed this work : in *Psal.* lxxviii. 49. it is said, that God cast upon the Egyptians the fierceness of his anger, wrath, indignation, and trouble by sending evil Angels among them : and the Jews themselves, whose authority our author regards much on this subject, have observed upon this verse, *Quæ in tenebris immittuntur mala (quando facta*

*primogenitorum cædes) recte demandantur malig-
nis spiritibus, quoniam ipsi sunt spiritus tene-
brarum.* Indeed *Moses* himself has deter-
mined the passage to this sense by the follow-
ing words: *the Lord will pass over the door,
and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto
your houses to smite you:* plainly intimating, says
an old Commentator, that this work was done
by an *evil Angel*, since he would have made
no distinction between the innocent and the
guilty, had not the destruction of the former
been peremptorily forbidden by God. And if
it be thus far probable that it was an *evil An-
gel*, who was employed upon this occasion, as
the instrument of God's Providence, how dan-
gerous must it be to imagine, that the *spot-
less Lamb of God* was the immediate Agent of
taking away life, when his proper business
upon earth was rather to give life? Nor will
the *Chaldee* paraphrasts, whom our author al-
so quotes, give any countenance to this ima-
gination: they paraphrase this verse indeed,
and others, by the *Word of Jehovah*; but they
probably meant only, that all the things re-
corded were done *mediately* by the order and
commission of the most High, delivered to
Angels, and not *immediately* by his own hand.

After

After these short observations on parts of the book of *Exodus*, our author returns again to the authority of the *Apocrypha*: In the book of *Wisdom*, he thinks the second person in the Godhead is to be understood by the *Almighty Word*: in *Ecclesiasticus*, he finds the divine Attribute of *Eternity* ascribed to *Wisdom*, and therefore concludes that the same personage is also to be understood by that character, especially as this *Wisdom* is described to be a *created Being*. “ As this Angel, says he, whose portion is *Israel*, is called the *Word* of God, “ because God employeth him to carry his “ word; so he is also, by the same figure of “ Rhetoric, called the *Wisdom* of God, because he is employed by God to execute the “ purposes of his wisdom. For thus the “ wise son of *Sirach*, when speaking of this “ guardian Angel of *Israel*, by the name of “ *Wisdom*, says, *I came out of the mouth of the most High, and covered the earth as a cloud. I dwelt in high places, and my Throne is in a cloudy pillar.* So the creator of all things “ gave me a commandment, and he that MADE “ me caused me to rest, and said, let thy dwelling be in Jacob, and thine inheritance in *Israel*. He created me from the beginning, “ before the world, and I shall never fail. In

“ the holy tabernacle I served before him ; and
 “ so was I established in Sion. Likewise in
 “ the beloved city he gave me rest, and in Jerusa-
 “ lem was my power. And I took root in an
 “ honourable people, even in the portion of the
 “ Lord’s inheritanc. I therefore being ETER-
 “ NAL, am given to all my children which are
 “ named of him, Ecclus. xxiv. 3——18.
 “ where it is to be observed, that this guar-
 “ dian Angel of *Israel* is here declared to
 “ have been a *created* Being ; yet because
 “ he was in the beginning, before the world,
 “ he styles himself *eternal*.” p. 50, 51.

I have quoted this passage at full length, as
 our author has quoted it, in order to give his
 opinion of it its full weight : but, unluckily
 for him, the further we go in the Context,
 the more we shall find that it makes against
 him. For indeed, nothing can be plainer than
 that the son of *Sirach* intended, by this descrip-
 tion of *wisdom*, to represent the origin, excel-
 lence, and greatness of true Religion. Thus, v.
 3. *I came out of the mouth of the most High:—*
 true of Revelation, which came forth origi-
 nally as the *voice of God*. Ver. 8. *Let thy dwell-*
ing be in Jacob, and thine inheritance in Israel :
 there alone the true Religion was professed
 and encouraged, whilst Idolatry overspread all
 other

other Nations and people, *ver. 9. He created me from the beginning, before the world, and I shall never fail:—*The moral laws of righteousness are unchangeable, and the rules of it therefore justly called eternal. *ver. 10. In the holy tabernacle I served before him,——the place of public worship and service,——and so was I established in Sion,——*God's holy hill, where the righteous and religious are often said in Scripture to dwell securely. *ver. 11. Likewise in the beloved city he gave me rest, and in Jerusalem was my power:—*the city, whither, as David triumphs, the tribes go up, even the tribes of the Lord; to testify unto Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord: which they did, by God's special commandment, (*Exod. xxiii. 17.*) to acknowledge the benefits, which they received from his Almighty goodness. *v. 12. And I took root in an honourable people, even in the portion of the Lord's inheritance——*true of God's peculiar people, the Jews, among whom Religion was first planted, and afterwards duly cultivated by the children of Israel his inheritance, *ver. 18. I therefore being eternal, am given to all my children, which are named of him.*—These words are omitted in several copies, and seem to be corrupted in those copies, which retain them: if they are to be retained however, the conjecture of Grotius is most
2 probable,

probable, that they ought to be interpreted, *I give to all my children, who are his elect, immortality:—true of the rewards of Religion, which always had the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. ver. 20. For my memorial is sweeter than honey, and mine inheritance than the honey-comb:—immediately applied by David to the commandments of the Lord, the true worship of God, and the practice of religious duties: Psal. xix. 11. ver. 23. is the key to the whole description, and determines the sense of it to that Law, which contained at that time the whole of Religion and Duty; all these things are the book of the covenant of the most high God, even the Law which Moses commanded for an heritage unto the congregations of Jacob.*

Now, what can be plainer, from this review, than that the author of this sublime picture meant only to recommend the practice, and extol the excellence of the Religion, under the Law, without any reference to the nature or person of the Divine Author of that Religion, which we profess and enjoy under the Gospel? the observations therefore, which are made upon it in the *Essay* are quite foreign to the purpose of the Apocryphal writer, and the application thereof to any separate

rate intelligent Being of actual existence has been long ago justly exploded, as presumptuous in itself, and dangerous in its consequences. The same is true of what our author quotes, p. 52, from a similar description in *Prov. viii. 22.* which *Solomon* intended as a caution to avoid the snares of the Harlot, mentioned in the foregoing chapter, drawn from the beauty and perfection of those rules of Doctrine and Wisdom, contained in God's holy Word, which *whoſo findeth*, ſo as to praſtiſe them, *findeth life, and ſhall obtain favour of the Lord.*

P. 53. " But *Philo Judæus* further obſerves, that this Archangel with many names, whoſe portion was *Iſrael*, was alſo called by *the name of God.*" And in order to prove this aſſertion of his Jewish Maſter, our author muſters up ſeveral paſſages in the old Teſtament, wherein he finds that the incommunicable name of *Jehovah* is applied, by the perſons concerned in the Hiſtory, to the *Angel of Jehovah*, which appeared unto them; from whence he would conclude, that the Angel alſo was of divine original, and was intitled to the name of Divinity, but yet could be nothing more than a created intelligent Agent. How far the aſſertion will hold good, and how juſt the application is to the uncreated Mediator

Mediator of the new Covenant, will best appear from a particular examination of the several passages. “ Thus, when *Hagar* fled
 “ from the face of her mistress, it is said,
 “ that *an Angel of Jehovah found her in the*
 “ *wilderness, and the Angel of Jehovah said*
 “ *unto her, Return to thy mistress: Gen. xvi.*
 “ 7, 9. yet *Moses* afterwards mentions this
 “ same person under the direct name of *Je-*
 “ *hovah: for, says he, Hagar called the name*
 “ *of Jehovah that spake unto her, Thou God*
 “ *seest me.*” *ver. 13.—p. 54.*

In answer to this we may remark, that as *Moses* often puts into the mouth of an Angel, who is sent upon a divine commission, words of the same import and authority, as if God himself immediately uttered them; so he frequently represents the applications of Suppliants, made to these messengers, in the same language, as if they were immediately addressed to the father of those Spirits. We have instances of both these observations in the chapter before us: *ver. 10. The Angel of the Lord said unto her, (Hagar) I will multiply thy seed exceedingly that it shall not be number'd for multitude; spoken authoritatively, in the first person, as if God himself had been speaking; and yet in the very next verse, he mentions*

tions

tions the Lord in the third person, *the Lord hath heard thy affliction*, which would plainly intimate to *Hagar*, that it was an Angel which appeared to her from the Lord, and in his name, and not the Lord himself. We might therefore as well conclude from this 11th verse, that God appeared and talked with *Hagar* face to face, (a privilege, which, by the confession of all, was never granted to any but *Moses*) as our author can argue, from *Hagar's* answer, *ver. 13.* that she looked upon this Angel, as the *Jehovah*, or at least, a person in the Godhead, because *Moses* transfers the divine appellation, as he had before done the divine authority, to the Angel; *she called the name of the Lord that spake unto her, Thou God see'st me.* All that can be understood from these verses is, that an Angel of Heaven was sent in God's name to reason and plead with her, and that she thought this presence of an Angel to be a Token of the divine presence, which had protected her from danger, and now advised her to *flee from the wrath to come*: she therefore gives God the glory, tho' she addresses herself to this messenger of God; and might well distinguish between *Jehovah* and the *Angel of Jehovah*, whilst she looked upon
the

the message that was delivered to her, as delivered in the name of the Lord.

Our author pursues this argument still further in his observations on the 18th and 19th chapters of *Genesis*: the substance of what he says, is, in short, that “ in *Gen. xviii. 1.* it
 “ is said, that *Jehovah* appeared unto *Abraham*—and lo, three men stood by him:
 “ that each of them had the appellation of
 “ *Jehovah* given them, it being positively
 “ said, that *Jehovah* said unto *Abraham*, *why*
 “ *did Sarah laugh?* And yet it is said after all
 “ this, that *the Men rose up from thence, &c.*
 “ *And Jehovah* said, *shall I hide from Abraham*
 “ *that thing which I do?* And when *two*
 “ *of the men* had turned their faces from
 “ thence, it is said, *Abraham stood yet before*
 “ *Jehovah*: that *Abraham* said to this *Jehovah*,
 “ *shall not the Judge of all the earth do*
 “ *right?* And when the discourse was ended,
 “ *Moses* says, that *Jehovah went his way.*
 “ Whence it is manifest, he thinks, beyond
 “ all doubt, that one of these three men who
 “ was left alone in conversation with *Abraham*,
 “ is called *Jehovah*, and *the Judge of all*
 “ *the earth.*” p. 54, 55.

So again in the next chapter, “ it is said,
 “ that *two Angels* came to *Sodom* at even—
 “ that

“ that *they* hastened Lot: and he said, that is,
 “ one of the Angels said, *Escape for thy life;*
 “ *for I cannot do any thing till thou be come thi-*
 “ *ther.—Then Jehovah rained upon Sodom*
 “ *and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from*
 “ *Jehovah out of Heaven.* Whence it is plain,
 “ that one of these two Angels is here also
 “ dignified with the appellation of *Jehovah*,
 “ and yet is represented as acting under the
 “ influence of another *Jehovah* in Heaven.”
 p. 56.

But if we again examine the Context, we
 shall find, that neither the title of *Jehovah* is
 given to these Angels by the inspired Histo-
 rian, nor does *Abraham* address himself to
 them in any other manner, than as to persons
 of some rank and authority. In the 1st verse,
 chap. xviii, it is said, that *the Lord appeared*
unto him; (*Abraham*;) understanding thereby
 the *Schechinah*, or Glory of the Lord, which
 had appeared to him a little before, chap. xvii.
 1. In the 2d verse, *lo, three men stood by him:*
 that is, Angels in the shape of men, which
 bodies they generally assumed. Upon sight of
 them, *Abraham bowed himself toward the ground*,
 out of great respect and civility, imagining by
 their appearance that they were persons of high
 birth and quality. ver. 3. *And said, my Lord,*

&c. Not that he now addressed himself to one in particular, but after the manner of the Hebrew, uses the singular Number with a *Kametz*, as a general invitation to them all; for in *ver. 4.* it is added, in the plural, *rest YOURSELVES under the tree*; and accordingly the Samaritan version renders it, *Domini mei, my Lords, &c. ver. 9. And they said unto him, where is Sarah thy wife?* Or rather, this should be translated in the singular, *And He said*, as the LXX have well translated it; for the separate embassies of these three Angels began now to disclose themselves: One is sent on purpose to confirm the promise, before made to *Abraham*, of a Son; and accordingly, he begins with the Patriarch upon that topic; the other two are silent, because their business is recorded in the next chapter, *ver. 10. And he said, I will certainly return unto thee, &c.* This promise God himself had made before to *Abraham*, and now the Messenger renews it in his own name, to signify to him, that he was a Messenger sent from God. *ver. 12. Sarah*, who thought herself past child-bearing, could not refrain from laughing within herself, through distrust and infidelity, when she heard that she was to have a son in her old age. *ver. 13. And the Lord*
said

said unto Abraham, wherefore did Sarah laugh, &c. This does not seem to be the question of the Angel, who had spoke to him immediately before, but it is rather to be looked upon as a voice issuing out from the *Schechinah*, God himself interposing to reprove her for not believing his Angel, when she might be well assured, that he delivered his message from that God, *with whom nothing is impossible.* This interpretation is confirmed by the repetition of the very same words in *ver. 14*, which the Angel had used, *ver. 10.* as if it had been said, if *Sarah* will not believe my words, as spoken by my Angel, let her take it from myself, *at the time appointed will I return, &c.* The Angel had now finished his commission to *Abraham*; the conversation between them ceased, as soon as the divine promise was ratified; and we find nothing more said of this interview with the Patriarch, but that he attended them all some part of the way towards *Sodom*: *ver. 16.*—This supposition will also remove the difficulty of the expressions in the History, which those Commentators imagine, who understand the same personage by *Man*, *Angel*, and *Lord*: thus, *ver. 16.* it is said, *And the men rose up from thence*, and yet, *ver. 17.* *the Lord said, &c.* Now it is very plain, that

the three men left *Abraham*, *ver.* 16. in the way to *Sodom*, tho' only two of them came to *Lot*; for the third had discharged his errand, which related only to *Abraham's* seed: what follows therefore to the end of this chapter, concerning the destruction of *Sodom*, was delivered immediately from the divine Majesty, which appeared, *ver.* 1. and which *Abraham* now saw and heard, when he returned to his tent alone. Thus will the History itself be cleared from all obscurity in the use of these different appellations; every character will appear with its proper title; and the *Ministers of God* will be easily distinguished from the *Lord of Hosts*.

And as the History will bear this construction to be put upon it; so *St. Paul* will furnish us with an argument, which will put it past all doubt, that these Messengers of God were common Angels only, and not, as our author would insinuate, the *eternal Son of his bosom*. In his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, chap. xiii. 2. He recommends to them the practice of Hospitality to Strangers from this consideration, *for thereby some have entertained Angels unawares*; alluding to this instance of *Abraham's* interview: Now if any one of these Angels had deserved an higher title than
the

the Angelic, (and certainly St. Paul wou'd have given the Lamb of God an higher in this place as well as in others) it wou'd have strengthened the recommendation of this virtue, and the Apostle wou'd rather have enforced it by introducing the Redeemer of the world, if he cou'd have done it, than from an example of the *ministry of Angels*: especially, as our Saviour himself often makes the poor and destitute his own representatives, and promises a reward to their relief, as if it had been administered to himself. But St. Paul understood Moses in the literal sense, and had conceived more sublime notions of the nature of Christ, than some modern Christians are willing to believe.

But to proceed—*chap. xix. 1.* Two of these Angels came to *Sodom* at even; the other was not intrusted with this part of the embassy, relating to Lot; in the following verses, they are called *Men*, but in the 24th verse, it is said, that *the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven*: which expression has led our author to imagine, that one of these Angels is dignified with the title of *Lord*; and the primitive Fathers of the Church have accordingly understood this of the Son of God, to

whom, as St. *John* speaks, *the Father hath committed all judgment*: but this seems to be only an idiom of the Scripture-language, and was intended, to express, that this judgment did not fall upon the *Sodomites* in the ordinary course of Nature, but that God, by an immediate interposition of his hand, sent down his vengeance upon them in a supernatural way. There are several instances of this phrase in the old Testament; I shall mention only one in *1 Sam. iii. 21.* where it is said, that *the Lord revealed himself to Samuel, by the word of the Lord*: I have the rather pitched upon this Text, because *Junius* understands by it *Jesus Christ*, the Angel of *Jehovah*: but it can mean nothing more, than that God revealed himself immediately to the Prophet, and not by visions or dreams. Other Prophets there had been before *Samuel*, but none, since *Moses*, to whom God spake, as he now did, with an audible voice.

“ Again, *Gen. xxxi. 11, 13.* *Jacob* says,
 “ *And the Angel of God spake to me in a dream,*
 “ *saying, Jacob; and I said, Here am I, and*
 “ *he said, I am the God of Bethel, &c.* whence
 “ it is plain, says our author, that an Angel
 “ of God, speaking to *Jacob*, calls himself
 “ *Jehovah the God of Bethel.* p. 57.

Answer.

Answer. Whenever such words as these are put into the mouth of an Angel, as has been observed before, he speaks in the name of God and not of himself: But even this observation is unnecessary to obviate the present difficulty; for this author has blended two appearances together, which ought to be separated. In the dream at *Bethel*, Angels appeared to Jacob upon the ladder, and the Lord himself at the top of it, whereas here only an Angel appears to him: one of these visions he had at the beginning of his last six years service; whereas this recorded in *ver.* 13. he had at the conclusion of that service; but, as Bishop *Patrick* judiciously remarks, *Moses* puts them both together, because they belong to the same matter. In this light, the Angel assumes no more than his own proper title, and the name of *Jehovah* is confined to the true *Jehovah* distinctly from the retinue that attended him.

“ Thus also we find it said, that the *Angel*
 “ of *Jehovah* appeared unto *Moses*, in a flame
 “ of fire out of the bush.—And when *Jehovah*
 “ saw that he had turned aside to see, &c.—
 “ Moreover, he said, *I am the God of thy Fa-*
 “ *thers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac,*
 “ *and the God of Jacob. Exod. iii. 2, 6.* where

“ it is manifest, that an *Angel* is called by
 “ *Moses, Jehovah*; and that the Angel calls
 “ himself, the God of *Abraham*, the God of
 “ *Isaac*, and the God of *Jacob*,” p. 58.—But
 here again two very different circumstances are
 confounded together. In verse 2d. The An-
 gel of the Lord appears indeed, as an atten-
 dant upon the *Schechinah*, which never ap-
 peared without the ministry of Angels; but
 in verses 4, and 6, the Historian makes God
 himself speak out of the midst of the bush,
 and not the Angel. And accordingly, when
 St. Stephen, *Acts* vii. 30. relates this Miracle,
 he says indeed that an *Angel of the Lord ap-*
peared in a flame of fire in a bush; but he adds,
that the voice of the Lord came unto him. He
 does not say that the *Angel* spoke the follow-
 ing words; it was a peculiar privilege grant-
 to *Moses*, that *the Lord talked with him face to*
face.* The title of *Jehovah* therefore is still
 reserved to himself alone, notwithstanding this
 observation of our author’s: and another great
 objection to the conclusion, which he wou’d

* Ipse *Stephanus* non obscure docet, Angelum fuisse, qui
Mosi in rubo apparuit; ipsum verò *Deum Mosi* locutum ver-
 ba ista, *Deus ego sum Patrum tuorum*. *Bull’s Def. Fid. Nic.*
 c. 1. S. 1. § 11. And *Athanasius* had given it as his opinion
 long before, Ὁ μὲν φαίνόμενος (Mosi, sc.) ἦν ἄγγελος ὁ δὲ
 θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ ἐλάλει. *Contr. Arian. Orat.* 4.

draw from it, is what Bishop *Patrick* remarks upon the place, “ that the second person in the blessed Trinity is not called simply an *Angel* any where, but with some addition, as, the *Angel of the Covenant*.”

Nor is it very difficult to reconcile the two Texts together, which our author quotes, p. 58. viz. *Exod. xiv. 19.* where it is said, that the *Angel of God conducted the camp of the Israelites*; and *Exod. xiii. 21.* where it is said that *Jehovah went before them, &c.* For this pillar of the cloud, and of fire was the divine *Schechinah*, attended by a troop of Angels: wherever this *Glory* appeared, the Lord was said to be present; and wherever the Lord was, there were his Angels, who might sometimes be sent from the *Schechinah* to conduct the *Israelites*, whilst God himself was present to direct them in their office. But the people were sufficiently taught to distinguish between the protection of the Lord, and the protection of his Angel; for upon their Idolatrous defection, he promises *Moses* to send an *Angel before them*, (*Exod. xxxiii. 2, 3.*) but threatens, at the same time, to withdraw his own gracious presence from them, which had hitherto appeared in their favour, together with the Angels of his presence.

Once

Once more—when *Moses* gives his account of the promulgation of the Law at Mount Sinai, *Exod.* xix. 3, &c. he resolves the whole proceeding into the immediate act of *Jehovah*; “and yet *St. Stephen*, who was a *Jew*, affirms, “that the Law was given by the Disposition “of Angels: and that it was an Angel, that “spoke to *Moses* from Mount Sinai. (*Acts* vii. “33, 38.) And *St. Paul* says, that the Law “was ordained of Angels: (*Gal.* iii. 9.) And “in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, he calls it the “word spoken of Angels.” (*Heb.* ii. 2.) p. 59. But *Moses* himself has obviated this difficulty, in his blessing of the children of *Israel* before his death. *Deut.* xxxiii. 2. The Lord, says he, came from Sinai unto them—with ten thousand of Saints; (or, as it should be translated, with his holy ten thousands, or holy myriads, that is, of Angels, *Psal.* lxviii. 17.) from his right hand went a fiery law for them; which plainly relates to the appearance at Mount Sinai, and clearly explains *Moses*’s opinion of it, that the divine presence was notified by his Angelic retinue, and that the Law was delivered from the *Schechinah* of God by the ministry or mediation of a glittering company of Angels, who waited on the Majesty of Heaven, and reported the Will of *Jehovah* to the people of *Israel*.

Israel. Well therefore might *Moses* say, that *Jehovah* called unto him out of the bush, because the Glory of the Lord appeared there, during the whole transaction; and yet very justly might *St. Stephen* and *St. Paul* ascribe this to the ministry of Angels, for they always accompanied the Glory of the Lord, and were the only *visible* tokens of God's special presence.

And as *Moses* himself reconciles the meaning of the old and new Testament, so *St. Paul* cuts off the conclusion, which our author would draw from supposing, that this *Jehovah* and the *Angel* signified the same person, that is, *Jesus Christ*: for the Apostle, *Heb. ii. 3.* gives the preference of the Gospel, which *Jesus* promulged, to the Law, in the promulgation of which the Angels administered, from this very consideration, that *the Law was spoken by Angels*, whereas the Gospel-salvation *began to be spoken by the Lord*; which difference of authority would have been insignificant and void, if the same person, who came into the world to preach the Gospel, had before appeared to proclaim the Law.

That *no man hath seen God at any time*, is a truth inculcated in the Scriptures both of the old and new Testament: " But *Moses* and
" *Aaron*,

“ *Aaron, Nadab and Abihu and seventy of*
 “ *the Elders of Israel, it is said, saw the God*
 “ *of Israel; (Exod. xxiv. 10.)* whereas,
 “ *when Moses afterwards applied to God, and*
 “ *begged it of him, as a favour, that he*
 “ *might see his Glory, or Face, that he*
 “ *might know him, Jehovah said unto him,*
 “ *thou canst not see my face; for there shall no*
 “ *man see me and live. (Exod. xxxiii. 20, &c.)*
 “ —Whence it is manifest, that the *Jehovah*
 “ *who followed the invisible Jehovah, was pro-*
 “ *bably that God of Israel, who was seen by*
 “ *Moses and Aaron, and Nadab and Abihu,*
 “ *and the seventy Elders of Israel; and who*
 “ *is called by God in another place, the simi-*
 “ *litute, or Image, of Jehovah. For, says*
 “ *Jehovah unto the people of Israel, with my*
 “ *servant Moses will I speak mouth to mouth;*
 “ *and the similitude of Jehovah shall be behold.”*
Numb. xii. 7, 8. Essay, p. 60, 61, 62.

I answer; when the seventy Elders of *Is-*
rael were permitted, as it is expressed, to *see*
the God of Israel, the following words will
 sufficiently determine the sense of the expres-
 sion: *And there was under his feet, as it were*
a paved work of a sapphire-stone, and as it were
the body of Heaven in his clearness; meaning,
 that the appearance was as bright as the sky
 itself,

itself, in its most shining lustre; and therefore truly applicable to that Glory of the Lord, the sight of which, as *Moses* adds, *ver. 17.* as an explanation of the whole, *was like devouring fire on the top of the Mount.* Accordingly, the *Chaldee* Paraphrasts expound the 10th verse, *They saw the Glory of the God of Israel;* and the LXX, *They saw, τὸν τόπον, the place of the God of Israel;* the ensigns of his Divine Majesty, to convince the Elders of his immediate presence, and to satisfy them in the truth of *Moses's* Divine Legation. But to imagine, from these words, that God did really appear to these men in an human, or any other shape, is contrary to Scripture as well as Reason, and what *Moses* himself takes great pains to confute, by reminding them, that they *saw no shape or likeness, but only heard a voice.* Or, to take the other side of the question, and to conclude from the incorporeity of God, that it cou'd not be himself, but his Angel, or Son, who assumed the *similitude* of God, is equally groundless and inconsistent with the History: For in *Deut. iv. 15.* it is said, *Ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb, out of the midst of the fire:* Now the LXX Elders were the Representatives of the people; and there-

fore altho' this appearance was at another time and place; yet it would have invalidated *Moses's* caution against the making of the similitude of any figure, if it had ever been understood, that the *similitude* of the Lord himself had once become the object of human sight.

What is promised, in *Numb. xii. 8.* that *Moses* should *behold the similitude of the Lord*, is well explained by our Bishop *Patrick* in a sense very different from what our English translation gives it: "I am apt to think, says he, the word "*not* should be here again repeated (as it must "*be* in some places to make out the sense, as "*Prov. xxv. 27.*) which will make the meaning plainly this, *He shall not behold the Lord* "*in similitudes and resemblances*, as other Prophets did. For the Hebrew word *Temunab* "*signifies the shape of a thing represented* "*either to the outward senses, or to the Imagination, not the thing itself.* Therefore "*it wou'd be to equal Moses with the rest of* "*the Prophets to say, he shou'd see the similitude of the Lord, for so did they: But God* "*did not thus reveal himself to Moses by images* "*and similitudes of things; but spake to him* "*himself, as it goes before, mouth to mouth."*

But even if we take the words in the literal sense, they must contradict our author's reasoning:

soning: for whereas other Prophets received advice and instructions from the Lord by visions and dreams, and the mediation of Angels, *Moses* had an higher privilege of receiving his directions immediately from God himself, without the intervention of Angelical appearances; this therefore cannot agree with that part of the supposition, which makes this similitude or image of God to be that Angel of *Jehovah*, who had before so often appeared to the Holy Patriarchs: for if so, *Abraham* and *Jacob* had as intimate a view of the presence of God, and might as well be said to speak with God *mouth to mouth*, as ever *Moses* did.—

This last interpretation is agreeable to the Degrees of Prophecy, which *Maimonides* points out. All Prophets, says he, did prophesy by the help or ministry of an Angel, and therefore they did see that, which they saw, in parables or under some dark representation; but *Moses* prophesied without the ministry of an Angel. *Vid. Maimon. de fund. Legis. c. 7.*

The petition which *Moses* makes to God, *I beseech thee, shew me thy glory*, which our author explains by this similitude of the invisible *Jehovah*, is more significant and important than he understands it to be. It was no less than a desire to *see God as he is*; it was there-

therefore denied him, as incompatible with the extent of human faculties; *thou canst not see my face, i. e.* my real self or essence, for what is only finite cannot comprehend infinity: but a Grant is added to this refusal, which *Moses* could understand and experience; *thou shalt see my back parts*, explained afterwards by that more affectionate promise; *I will make all my goodness pass before thee*; my favour and protection of you and your people; *I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee*; more fully explained by the exercise of his Attributes, in the ways of his Providence, *the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious*;—*keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression and sin.* Here is no intimation of any visible appearance in human shape; the dispensations of Providence, in behalf of the *Israelites*, are clearly promised; man might see and discover the events themselves, but it was impossible for him to understand the essence of that principle, which gives life to every thing besides the one, uncreated Being. The connexion therefore which our author would make between these several passages is quite imaginary, and his observation as groundless, that “ this Being, which followeth *Je-*
bovah, this way, this *Glory of Jehovah*,
 “ whom

“ whom the invifible *Jehovah* proclaimed to
“ be *Jehovah* as well as himfelf, is manifef-
“ ly that Angel, who was appointed by God
“ to conduct the *Israelites* into the promifed
“ Land.” p. 63. For the Attributes of *one*
God only are proclaimed; by the exercife of
them are underftood the *Way*, the *Glory* of the
Lord: his own immediate prefence defended
the paffage of the *Israelites*, and his Angel, de-
legated by his authority, and acting in his
name, directed them aright.

There is only one paragraph more, which
contains instances from the old Testament to
prove this fecond *Jehovah* (or *Jefus Chrift*) to
be an Angel of the firft, or fupreme God, and
that I fhall quote at full length. “ And hence
“ it comes to pafs, that this fecond *Jehovah* is
“ in a particular manner diftinguifhed by the
“ appellation of the *God of Israel*, the *Jehovah*
“ of *Zion*, and the *Jehovah* of the *Jews*. For
“ thus the Prophet *Hofea*, fpeaking by autho-
“ rity from God the great *Jehovah*, faith,
“ (*Hof. i. 7.*) *But I will have mercy on the*
“ *houfe of Judah, and will fave them by Jeho-*
“ *vah their God.* And *Zechariah* the Pro-
“ phet, fpeaking of the fame people, faith,
“ (*Zeck. xi. 12.*) *I will ftrengthen them in Je-*
“ *hovah, and they fhall walk up and down in*

E

“ his

“ his name, *saith* Jehovah. Not in my
 “ name, but in his name, *saith* the invisible
 “ *Jehovah*; that is, in the name of *the God of*
 “ Israel, whom they had seen. And, in an-
 “ other place, the same Prophet *saith*, (*Zech.*
 “ ii. 10, 11.) *Sing and rejoice, O Daughters*
 “ *of Zion, for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the*
 “ *midst of thee, saith Jehovah: And many Na-*
 “ *tions shall be joined to Jehovah in that day,*
 “ *and shall be my people: And I will dwell in*
 “ *the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the*
 “ *Jehovah of Hosts hath sent me unto thee.*
 “ Where the *Jehovah of Zion* is plainly dis-
 “ tinguished from the *Jehovah of Hosts*, and
 “ acknowledgeth himself to be sent by him.”

p. 64, 65.

Answer—Interpreters have long ago observ-
 ed, that this verse in *Hosea* might probably
 allude to the salvation of the *Jews*, which was
 to be accomplished by the *Messiah*, the Lord,
 as they think, being spoken of as a distinct
 person from the principal author of the salva-
 tion here promised. But the promise seems
 rather to relate to some *temporal* deliverance,
 as the means of it are opposed to the instru-
 mentality of those second causes, mentioned
 in the latter part of the verse. The Hebrews,
 it is well known, often use the Noun for the

Pronoun :

Pronoun: the expression therefore, *I will save them by the Lord their God*, may signify only, *I will save them by my own immediate power and assistance, not by the help of those human, ordinary means, by bow, by sword, by battle, by horses, or by horsemen*: And accordingly, we find the Prophecy accomplished in a supernatural way, when their enemies, the *Assyrians*, were destroyed: for in *2 Kings xix. 35*. God makes the same promise, *I will defend this city to save it, for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake*; and we are told how miraculously it was fulfilled in the next verse, *And it came to pass, that night, that the Angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand; and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses*.

So again in *Zech. x. 12*. the same Hebrew custom obtains of using the Noun for the Pronoun; and God also promises his own immediate protection by the Prophet, in expressions of the like import: *I will strengthen them in the Lord; i. e. I myself will be their strength and their salvation; and they shall walk up and down in his name, saith the Lord; i. e. their lives shall be piously governed by the laws of God, and God, in return, will prosper their*

undertakings, in a manner suitable to the integrity of their hearts. There is no intimation given of any other God besides the Lord of Hosts: He had constantly protected and fought for them, whilst they obeyed his voice; they were his people, and he had always professed himself to be their God.

The other Text in *Zech. ii. 11.* is most grossly misinterpreted by our author—*And thou shalt know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me unto thee*—for these words are evidently spoken by the Prophet of himself; and are as much as if he had said, when you see all these things come to pass, then shall you know, that I am sent by the Lord, and that my commission is truly founded in the authority of God: similar to the expression of *Ezekiel*, upon a like occasion, *chap. xxxiii. 33.* *And when this cometh to pass, (lo, it will come) then shall they know that a Prophet hath been among them.*

“ Now then, says our author, resting satisfied with the strength of his foregoing proofs, let us see what foundation there is in the Scriptures of the old Testament for the opinion of a third person, whom the Jews ἀποθεάζουσιν, paid divine Honour to.” p. 73. The first Text to this purpose is that before-mentioned, relating to the destruction of

of Sodom; viz. Jehovah rained—brimstone and fire from Jehovah out of Heaven. But as the sense of this has been already examined, I shall add nothing more to that interpretation of it.

The next proof is a more remarkable one, which contains a double Prophecy, the one applicable to the times of the *Jewish* Polity, and the other to the *Christian* dispensation; the former of these the *Jews* might understand, but the latter they could not without the assistance of the light of the Gospel; and therefore as far as it relates to our author's argument, it was inexplicable to the *Jews* under the Law. It is in *Zech. iv. 14.* *These (two Olive-branches) are the two anointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth.* In this chapter the *Jews* are comforted with the promise of having their Temple (signified by the figure of the *golden candlestick*) rebuilt by the success of *Zerubbabel* and *Joshua*, called here the *two Olive-branches*: the Prophet therefore, to carry on the Metaphor, calls these two great restorers of the public worship of it, the *two anointed ones*, or, as the margin has it, the *two sons of oyl*; thereby to signify to the *Jews*, that *Zerubbabel* as King, and *Joshua* as Priest, would constantly attend

upon the service of the Sanctuary, and take care that it was duly performed; or, in the language of the Prophecy, these Olive-trees would supply the candlestick with oyl from their several branches. In another light, we may interpret this of the supply of Grace from God's Holy Spirit, as it is administer'd to the Church of Christ: but the Prophecy, as it stands, cou'd never be understood of this state of the Christian Church, until the founder of it had made a more expresse promise of the *Comforter*, that *unction from the holy one, which teacheth us of all things*.

To make out the three persons in the Trinity, we are again led back to the consideration of the title of the second: and as " he
 " is called by *Isaiab*, the Angel of God's pre-
 " sence, and distinguished in *Daniel* by the
 " name of *Michael*; so there is also another
 " Angel named by a particular name in the
 " Scriptures of the old Testament, who is
 " called *Gabriel*; which *Gabriel*, according
 " to St. *Luke*, called himself also *the Angel*
 " *that standeth in the presence of God*. So that
 " here are plainly two Angels, one of which,
 " for distinction sake, is called *Michael*, and
 " the other *Gabriel*, which are described as
 " standing in the presence of God, or, as Ze-
 " *chariah*

“ *chariah* expresseth it, *which stand by the Lord of the whole earth.*” p. 74, 75.

Answer——By the expressions, the *Angel of God's presence*, and the *Angel that standeth in the presence of God*, is generally understood the nature and office of a good Angel, who constantly attends the presence of God to receive his commands, and to convey notices of them to Mankind: and in this sense, the phrase is equally applicable to all Angels with these two, *Michael* and *Gabriel*. Nay, our Saviour himself applies it to all, in *Mat. xviii. 10.* *For I say unto you, that in Heaven their Angels do always behold the face of my father, which is in Heaven.* And indeed, our author too seems to give some countenance to this interpretation; for he explains the expressions by the words of *Zechariah*, *which stand by*, (or as it should be rendered, *before*) *the Lord of the whole earth*; which evidently mean, to minister to him in holy things, as a Servant waits the orders of his Master: Analogous to this is the Kingdom of God in Heaven, where, as Daniel describes it in his vision, very much to our present purpose, *thousand thousands ministered unto him*, (the ancient of days, i. e. God) *and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him.* *Dan. vii. 10.*

And as this characteristic of the two Angels is found not to be peculiar to themselves, and therefore not particularly descriptive of the second and third persons in the Godhead, so neither do the words of *Isaiab* imply, that the Angel of God's presence, there mentioned, was the immediate deliverer of the children of *Israel*; for our english translation of that verse is directly opposite to the letter of the original, and the two verses (*chap. lxiii. 8, 9.*) are separated from each other in an improper place. The construction, which the LXX Interpreters have put upon it is the nearest to the *Hebrew*, and the whole passage should be rendered, agreeably to their sense of it, in the following manner: *ver. 8. For he said, surely they are my people, children that will not lie: so he was their Saviour in all their affliction. ver. 9. No instrument* (i. e. second cause, for so the word מִיָּד signifies) *or Angel of his Presence saved them; in his love and in his pity He redeemed them, (by his own immediate hand) and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old.*—Neither the expressions therefore, applied to both these Angels, nor the good office, which is ascribed to one of them, will warrant our author's opinion of their being understood of the second and third essences in the blessed Trinity. Our

Our author's whole Hypothesis, in relation to his belief of this Trinity, is comprized in few words, p. 75. "As it appears, that the Archangel *Michael* is that person who is called the *second Essence* by the *Jews*, so, upon inquiry, we shall find, that the Angel *Gabriel* has a very good title towards being considered as that *third Essence*, or Being, to which the *Jews* paid divine Honours." The ground or foundation of this divine Honour was an opinion the *Jews* had that this third essence was that Holy power, by which they were illuminated when they were divinely inspired. "Now it is manifest, that the Angel *Gabriel* was employed in the administration of this office, since it was, undoubtedly for this purpose that *Gabriel* was sent to the Prophet *Daniel*, to make him understand the vision; and to give him skill and understanding; and therefore, it is probable, that this Angel *Gabriel* was that Holy Spirit, who was employed by God in illuminating the rest of the Prophets of old, and who is so often mentioned in the Scriptures of the old Testament, under the title of *the Holy Spirit*, the *Spirit of God*, or the *Spirit of Jehovah*." p. 77.

Answer

Answer—It may be incontestably proved from several passages in Scripture that all Prophecy, whether by visions or dreams, is attributed to the ministry of Angels: they conveyed the divine influx into the mind of the Prophet, and *holy men of old spake as they were moved* by the effect of this conveyance; *how* or by *what means*, it is as insignificant, as it is presumptuous for us to inquire: but none of the *Jews* ever inferred from thence, that the Angel, which appeared, upon any such occasion, was the *Spirit of God* whose will they declared; quite the reverse to this, the *Talmudists* maintain, that true Prophecy was communicated by Angels, who were the *ministers* only of the Prophetic Spirit; and one of them in particular so far distinguishes them, as to observe, that according to the disposition of the Receiver the degree and quality of the Angel was accommodated. In *Daniel*, *Zechariah*, and the *Apocalypse*, we find all things perpetually represented and interpreted by Angels: *Gabriel* appeared to *Daniel* in his vision, and instructed him in the full import of it; the Prophet accordingly felt the impulse of the divine Spirit; the immediate operation on his mind he ascribed to the Angel; the truth of his Prophecy rested upon the certainty he had, that this Angel was a messenger from God. In

In the new Testament likewise, we find all visions universally ascribed to this Ministry: Thus, *Acts* xxvii. 23. St. Paul argues, *there stood by me this night the Angel of God*, i. e. in a Prophetic dream; in consequence of which, he comforts his fellow-travellers with an assurance of their lives. And, *Acts* xii. when the Angel of God appeared to *Peter*, and brought him out of prison, he cou'd scarce be persuaded, but that all this was a vision: a clear proof, that the appearance of an Angel was the received *criterion* of a prophetic vision. But our author himself has quoted an instance of this kind from the new Testament, which at once establishes this truth, and fully confutes his own opinion, that this Angel was the Holy Ghost; or, which comes to the same thing, that the third person in the blessed Trinity was the Angel *Gabriel*.

“ It is very remarkable, says he, that altho’
 “ the Virgin *Mary* is positively said to have
 “ been *found with child of the Holy Spirit*, and
 “ to have *conceived of the Holy Spirit*; yet the
 “ person sent to her from God upon this oc-
 “ casion, calls himself *an Angel*, and in par-
 “ ticular, *the Angel Gabriel* that standeth in
 “ the presence of God; who under the old
 “ Covenant had been sent to inspire *Daniel*
 “ with

“ with skill and understanding. Which An-
 “ gel *Gabriel* being sent from God unto the Vir-
 “ gin *Mary*, *The Angel*, says *St. Luke*, came
 “ in unto her,—*And the Angel answer’d and*
 “ said unto her, *The Holy Spirit shall come*
 “ upon thee — *therefore also that holy thing,*
 “ *which shall be born of thee, shall be called the*
 “ *Son of God.*” p. 107.

Now *St. Luke* very particularly distinguishes between the message of the *Angel*, and the operation of the *Holy Ghost*: He speaks of them as two distinct persons, the *Angel* saying unto her, and the *Holy Ghost* coming upon her: and the words themselves, which he puts into the mouth of the *Angel*, take away all possibility of our confounding them. The *Angel* said to *Mary*, (not that an *Angel*, but that) the *Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee;—called therefore the *Son of God*; not the son of a created Being, for then *Christ* would have been the son of a creature; not the son of the *Angelic* order, for then *Christ* also had, contrary to the assertion of the *Apostle*, *taken upon him the nature of Angels*. The conclusion then is very clear, that neither *Gabriel* was the same with the *Holy Ghost*, nor is the *Holy Ghost* to be reckoned an *Angel*.

All that our author urges further upon this subject from the authority of the old Testament serves to prove the personality of the Holy Spirit, which ought by all means to be maintained and believed; only, he sometimes confounds the Agent with the effects of his Agency, and interprets those Texts of the Spirit itself, which signify only the gifts and graces of which he is the author and bestower.

“ Thus, when God ordered *Moses* to appoint
 “ seventy Elders, who should assist him in
 “ the distribution of justice, it is said, that
 “ *Jehovah came down in a cloud, and spake un-*
 “ *to him, and took of the Spirit that was upon*
 “ *Him, and gave it to the seventy Elders; and*
 “ *it came to pass, that when the Spirit rested*
 “ *upon them, they prophesied.*” Numb. xi. 25.
 p. 80. Where by the *Spirit* is evidently meant
 those gifts and endowments of wisdom and
 judgment, which were necessary to qualify
 them for a share in the Government, and all
 which (as St. *Paul* distinguishes the gift from
 the giver) *worketh that one and the self same*
Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he
will.

This interpretation is confirmed by the construction that the learned Bp. *Patrick* (which is also *Bonfrerius's*) has put upon our author's

next

next quotation, where “ it is observed of
 “ *Moses*, that when he came the last time down
 “ from Mount *Sinai*, *the skin of his face shone*,
 “ as an outward and visible token of the in-
 “ ward assistance and illumination of the *Holy*
 “ *Spirit*. And therefore God also command-
 “ ed *Moses*, when he appointed *Joshua* for his
 “ Successor, to *take Joshua*,—and, says he,
 “ *thou shalt lay some of thine Honour* upon
 “ Him.” *Numb.* xxvii. 20. p. 80, 81. This
 connexion had been pointed out by the Hebrew
 Doctors, and the word *Honour* is sometimes
 translated *Glory*, to make the application stron-
 ger: which, as our excellent Commentator
 observes, might have passed for truth, or at
 least that thereby was meant some great in-
 crease of illustrious gifts of mind, which pro-
 cured *Joshua* such reverence as *Moses* had, if
 it had been said, that God put some of *Moses*’s
 glory upon him; whereas *Moses* is command-
 ed to do it; which makes it most probable,
 that the command, *thou shalt put some of thine*
Honour upon him, signifies, communicate some
 of thy authority to him at present; and not let
 him be any longer as thy Minister, but as an
 associate in the Government. The reason of
 this communication establishes the true sense
 of it, *that all the congregation of the children*
of Israel may be obedient.

In

In the new Testament however, our author has another passage ready, which fully comes up to his purpose, where “ St. *John* plainly
 “ calleth that *Holy Spirit*, by which he was
 “ inspired with the book of *Revelations*, an
 “ *Angel*. For his words are these, *The Re-*
 “ *velation of Jesus Christ, which God gave un-*
 “ *to him, to shew unto his servants things, which*
 “ *must shortly come to pass; and he sent and sig-*
 “ *nified it by his Angel; unto his servant John.*
 “ And yet thro’ this whole book, he calls this
 “ Revelation, the dictates of the Spirit. *Rev.*
 “ *ii. 7, &c. He that hath ears to hear, says he,*
 “ *let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the*
 “ *Churches.*” p. 106.

Answer——St. *John* represents his whole vision, as conducted by the ministry of an Angel, and that Angel he looked upon as the Minister of the Holy Ghost. Whatever therefore was thus communicated to him by the means of the Angel he reckoned to be the sense and dictates of God’s Holy Spirit; but when he calls them such, he purposely drops the mention of the Angel in like manner, as he omits his own name in the repetition, tho’ what the Spirit saith unto the Churches was as much signified to them by himself, as by the Angel which revealed it unto him. Nor
 is

is this an uncommon form of speech in the Holy Scriptures: Thus, *St. Paul*, when he cautions the *Hebrew Converts* against Apostacy, from a consideration of the difference between *Christ* and *Moses*, applies the words of the Psalmist in the same manner, *wherefore as the HOLY GHOST saith, To day if ye will hear his voice, &c. (Psf. xcv. 8. and Heb. iii. 7.)* because *David* composed the Psalm by the help and assistance of the *Spirit* of Prophecy. So again, in a still stronger instance, our Saviour himself complies with the same form of expression: *Mat. xvii. 12.* For he removes the scruples of the *Jews* about the signs of his own appearance in the flesh, by observing, *I say unto you, that Elias is come already*; whereas it was *John the Baptist*, who had appeared *in the spirit and power of Elias*. The application is too obvious to need any further explanation of *St. John's* manner of writing.

But perhaps the Apostle had another meaning in his expression, which will take away all possibility of confounding the *spirit* with the *Angel*. His vision was evidently a Prophecy relating to the future state of the Church: in this he addresses himself to the several Churches, and at the end of each exhortation he subjoins an admonition, *He that bath*

an

an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches; where by Spirit may most probably be understood, the doctrine itself: As if he had said, This is the substance of the Revelation of *Jesus Christ*, which hath been conveyed to me in the spirit of Prophecy, by the usual means of conveying such Prophecies, the appearance of an Angel in a vision. What seems to confirm this opinion is, that St. *John* uses the word *Spirit* in this sense in his Epistle, 1 *John* iv. 1. *Believe not every Spirit*, i. e. every doctrine; *but try the Spirits*, i. e. examine the doctrines, *whether they be of God*: and in the same chapter, the *spirit of Anti-christ* must signify, the false doctrine of Anti-christ.

The Scriptures of the old and new Testament agree in their descriptions of the nature and essence of the Godhead: “ as he is described by *Moses*, under the character of that God, *whose face cannot be seen*; so St. *Paul* characterises him as that God, *whom no man hath seen, or can see*: which invisible God cannot therefore possibly be the same with that God, who *was manifested in the flesh*. Whence it appears, that here is a distinction made by the Apostles between the Divinity of God the Father and of God the Son.” p. 87, 88.

Answer—This distinction then our author gathers from the *invisible* nature of God the Father, and the *visible* appearance of God the Son: but he purposely confounds our idea of God the Son, considered as part of the Godhead, with the idea which we ought to have of him, when considered as the Mediator of God's dispensation, and as the Antients speak, κατ' ἐκνομίαν. In the former view, the Son is equally incomprehensible and invisible with the Father; in the latter, his incarnation subjects him to imperfections, that were not natural to him before: whilst he was in *the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God*; but when he *took upon him the form of a Servant*, he *emptied* himself of his original glory, and was by that means made capable of becoming the object of human sight, as well as the object of human sufferings. The Apostle therefore preserves the mention of the Godhead in the recognition of the Manhood, by which he must either mean the *one, true, invisible* God, distinguishable no otherwise than in the divine counsel, or he wou'd have given some countenance to the belief of a plurality of Gods, which both Scripture and Reason utterly disclaim. And since, even in this passage, there is a tacit opposition between the *Gentile* Deities, and the *Christian* Redeemer, and yet
I
he

he is styled God, tho' he manifested himself as a man, it follows, that the name of God is attributed to him in such a manner, as can denote in one other than the *one, invisible, eternal* God; and that therefore all distinction in their Divinity is groundless and inconsistent.

St. Paul has told us, that *there be gods many, and lords many*, but withal has taught us, that *to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things*; "that is, says our author, "there is but one supreme God, in comparison "of whom there is *none other but he*; and with "regard to whom Jesus Christ is only to be "called Lord and not God." p. 87. But this interpretation is wholly confuted by the words themselves, in which, as the learned Bishop Pearson remarks, as the Father is opposed as much unto the *many Lords*, as *many Gods*; so is the Son as much unto the *many Gods* as *many Lords*; the Father being as much Lord as God, and the Son as much God as Lord.

But it is objected further, that "St. Paul "positively declares, that *the Son also*, that is, "even in his highest state of exalted Glory, "shall be *subject unto him that did put all things "under him, that God may be All in All.* "1 Cor. xv. 28." p. 90. How then, it may be asked, can he be subject unto God the Fa-

F 2
ther,

ther, if he be equal to him? To which I answer, the Apostle's argument relates to the *mediatorial* office and kingdom of Christ, and therefore whatever subjection is ascribed to him in this capacity, must be understood of that nature, which he assumed to perform that office. In this sense, he *must reign 'till he hath put all enemies under his feet*; the commission, which he undertook, as the Redeemer of the world, could not be completed, 'till the grand enemy thereof was defeated in his attempts, and death, which was introduced at first by the deceitfulness of that enemy, was destroyed by a triumph over death and the grave. This triumph was effected by the Resurrection of Christ, the earnest and pledge of a general Resurrection; at which the whole business of his *mediatorial* Kingdom will be at an end; the part he had to act upon earth, in the œconomy of man's Redemption, will be closed up; and he who was appointed to rule in the midst of his enemies during their rebellion, will then resign up his commission after their defeat and subjection; *that God may be All in All*; that, by this means, every thing may be accomplished, that was at first intended, for the perfect happiness and bliss of God's elect in the kingdom of Heaven, where a new form of Government will succeed, which will be administered

I

nistered by the *Deity* only, *i. e.* by God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. In this argument then, there is no intimation of an Inferiority in the divine nature of Christ: He, says St. *Austin*, as God, has us in subjection to himself with the Father, tho' as our Priest, he is subject to the Father, together with us. He relinquished no dominion by his humiliation as a man, but continues, in his divine essence, to reign over them that are saved, as King of Kings, and Lord of Lords for ever and ever.

Nor does this interpretation favour the opinion of Christ's being only the viceroy or vicergerent to God, tho' our author, in pursuance of his reasoning, has adopted that opinion, explaining St. *Paul's* expression in another Epistle, *the image of the invisible God. Col. i. 15.* by, "the visible Image, or delegated Representative in power of the invisible God." p. 91. But the meaning of Christ's being the image of the invisible God, is sufficiently clear from the following words; *the first-born of every creature*, or, begotten before every creature; in this respect therefore the image of God, because he was the Son of God before the world began; bearing the likeness and perfections of the divine essence in as full a manner, as a son of man can bear the resemblance or features of his fa-

ther that begot him. Agreeably to this it is said, that the *fulness of the Godhead dwelleth in him bodily*; that he is the *brightness of God's glory, and the express image of his person*, or, as it should rather be rendered, of his substance; and that he was *in the form or nature of God* before his incarnation, as truly and perfectly, as he was *in the form or nature of a servant* after it, by being *made in the likeness of man*. Human nature therefore was evidently that *form of a servant*, and the Divine essence was that *form or image of God*.*

* *Æquè non erit Deus Christus vere, si nec Homo vere fuit in effigie Hominis constitutus—quod si in effigie & imagine, quâ Filius patris vere Dei prædicatus est, etiam in effigie & imagine Hominis, quâ Filius Hominis vere Hominem inventum—Tertul. adv. Marc. l. 5. c. 20. p. 486. So also Athanasius—ἡ γὰρ ἐκεῖνη μορφή καὶ τὸ εἶδος ἐστὶν ἡ εἰκών· ἐπεὶ τοίνυν καὶ ὁ υἱὸς εἰκὼν ἐστὶ τῷ πατρὶ, ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐστὶ νοεῖν, ὅτι ἡ θεότης καὶ ιδιότης τῷ πατρὶ τὸ εἶναι τῷ υἱῷ ἐστὶ—ἢ ἐκ μέρους δὲ ἡ τῆς θεότητος μορφή· ἀλλὰ τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς τῷ πατρὶ θεότητος ἐστὶ τὸ εἶναι τῷ υἱῷ· καὶ ὅλος θεὸς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός. Orat. 4. contr. Arian. p. 458.*

Accordingly, the words *εἰκών* and *μορφή* are used as equivalent expressions: thus, in *Euseb. Ecc. Theol. p. 96. εἰκόνα ἀποκαλεῖ διατὸ ἐν μορφῇ θεῷ ὑπάρχειν. — υἱὸς θεὸς διατὴν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πατρὶ, ὡς ἐν εἰκόνι μόρφωσιν. v. Novat. p. 83, 84. Ed. Wels. περὶ τῆς θεότητος τῷ υἱῷ ὁ Ἀπόστολος διδάσκει, λέγον, ὅς ἐν μορφῇ θεῷ ὑπάρχει. Euseb. Dem. Ev. p. 25. εἰκὼν τῆς πατρικῆς θεότητος, καὶ διὰ τῆτο θεόν, Euseb. Ecc. Theol. p. 62.*

In opposition to this however, our author remarks, “ that the whole conduct and behaviour and doctrine of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, while he was in this world, was correspondent to the opinion of the superiority of God the Father, over God the Son ; for he not only speaks of this in general words, as, *the Father is greater than I* ; (John xiv. 28.) But acknowledges that his whole conduct, not only while he was in this world, but before he came into it, before he had taken human nature upon himself, was in submission to the will and commands of God. For he acknowledges, in numberless places, that it was the Father who sent him, and gave him a commandment what to do. For, says he, *I must work the work of him that sent me* : and again he says, *The Father which sent me he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak*. And again, *As the Father gave me commandment, so do I*. John ix. 4. xii. 49. xiv. 31.” p. 97, 98.

But we ought to distinguish between the abstracted nature of the second person in the Holy Trinity, and the *Messias* incarnate : for, as that second person, we meet with expressions, relating to him, that make him co-equal with the Father, *I and my Father are*

one: *He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, —I am in the Father, and the Father in me,* and the like, shewing the Divinity of his essence: but, considered in the capacity of the *Messias*, he was a Messenger of the Father; and therefore having, in this light, received authority from him, he could not go beyond his commission either to speak or do less or more. This indeed denotes some subordination in the divine *æconomy*, but does not extend to an inequality in the divine *essence*. The characters of Divinity are constantly interspersed with the terms of Manhood: but the expressions which relate to this jointly with the Messiahship ought not to invalidate the belief of an equality with the Godhead, any more, than, in a political *æconomy*, one man can be said to be less an human creature than another, because he is subordinate and minister to that other, in such offices, as *authority* has appointed him. The Son, in like manner, is equal to the Father in respect of his nature, tho' the Father may be said to be greater than the Son in the communication of the Godhead *.

It is moreover observable, that the word

* Δῆλον ὅτι τὸ μείζον μὲν ἐστὶ τῆς αἰτίας, τὸ δὲ ἴσον τῆς φύσεως, says *Gregor. Naz. Orat. 2. de Filio.*

Filius Dei, quia ex Deo Patre natus, eo certe nomine Patri suam omnem auctoritatem acceptam refert: neque minus ipsi honorificum à Patre *mitti*, quàm ex Patre nasci. *Bull. Def. Fid. Nic.* Command-

Commandment is sometimes used, (and the same is true of the Greek ἐντέλλεσθαι) where a *superior* authority of governing and obliging is not implied. Thus, our Saviour tells the Jews, *no man taketh it (i. e. my life) from me, but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again: (John x. 18.)* a power therefore absolute, and peculiar to God only; and yet he adds, *This commandment have I received of my Father:* there could be no obligation imposed, where the action was so much a voluntary one; this *commandment* therefore was his *mediatorial* commission, which he undertook as the Son of God, and executed as the Son of man.

But our author is not satisfied with the opinion of the inferiority of the Son to the Father, he imagines also, that “during
“ the time of his continuance here upon
“ earth, he is represented all along as being
“ under the guidance and conduct of the *Holy Spirit.*” p. 109. And in support of this opinion he alledges, as usual, the authority of Scripture; more particularly, where it is said, that *Jesus was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil.* Mat. iv. 1. In this temptation he was actuated indeed by a Divine impulse to undergo it, but this does not destroy the voluntary part of the action; it
only

only means, that the whole scheme of man's Redemption was laid in the Divine counsel, and that our Saviour's life was in every respect conformable to that predetermined counsel of God: and to say that Christ was thus far governed will no more imply an inferiority in the Son, than to say, that God is guided and directed by the rectitude of his own will is any derogation to the supreme authority of the Father. His other quotation, p. 110. is still more foreign to the purpose: for if it is said in one place, that *Christ cast out Devils by the Spirit of God*: (Mat. xii. 28.) it is explained in another by a similar phrase, *with the finger of God*, (Luke xi. 20.) which has been always understood to mean, the power of God: our Saviour therefore would establish the belief of his Divine mission from this consideration, that he did such works, as Omnipotence alone could perform.

After Christ's Ascension however the subject of power is changed upon us, and the Son gains a superiority over the Holy Spirit: and to prove this we are referred to a Text, relating only to the method of accomplishing our Redemption, not at all to the nature or rank of the author of it. "*It is expedient for you,*" says Jesus to his Disciples, *that I go away;* "*for if I go not away, the Comforter will not*"
" come

“ *come unto you ; but if I depart, I will send him unto you :*” p. 111. (*John xvi. 7.*) intimating only, that this his departure from them, before the coming of the Holy Ghost, was agreeable to the method of the Divine dispensation in the Redemption of Mankind, the several steps of which were ordered and settled in the Divine counsel from the beginning: and the expression, *I will send him unto you*, which is mentioned as the consequence of *Jesus's* being glorified, means the commencement of those happy effects of his exaltation into Heaven, which his death had purchased for us, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost would secure to our Faith, if we applied the proper means of deserving them. This therefore implies no superiority in the *Son* over the *Spirit* of God ; it only points out the necessity of this spiritual assistance, after Christ's departure, in order to propagate and establish that Religion, in the hearts of men, which, in his life time, he had planted in the world. Accordingly, our Saviour sometimes says, *I will send him unto you* ; and at others, *whom the Father will send in my name, to teach you all things* ; but with authority absolute and uncontrouled, *dividing to every man severally as he will* : in this respect therefore equal to the Father, who worketh all in all ; so that in this Kingdom of Christ and
of

of God all things are now done by the *power of the Spirit of God* *.

This is the sum and substance of all that our author has advanced, upon Scripture-authority, in defence of his opinion concerning the nature of the blessed Trinity; and from this examination of the several proofs, I hope it will appear, that his foundation is imaginary, and the superstructure weak. None of the Texts in the old Testament seem to convey so low an idea of the *Messiah*, as that of a created *Angel*; the Historical parts, I believe, have not introduced him at all, as an Agent in the History; and the Prophets have spoken of him in such high Terms, as can comport only with Divinity itself: the *Almighty God*, the *everlasting Father* is, in the language of *Isaiah*, the same in nature with this *Prince of peace*. Although he made the first tender of the Gospel to the *Jews* under the new Covenant, yet it is sufficiently clear, that he never acted in their behalf under the old: They were always God's peculiar people, and their protection accordingly came *immediately* from himself, unless where his own interposition was unnecessary, and then the *ministry of Angels* supplied the place of it. In any of their distresses *Moses* applies directly to God; the language of a

* Vid. St. *Chrysostom*. Tom. 5. p. 10. ap. *Pearson*. p. 315.

Divine Mediator was, in those days, unknown to the *Jews*; their Lawgiver was the only Mediator between God and them; *a man of like passions with themselves*; only, they trusted, in some measure, to the Guardianship of Angels, the Vicegerents of God, some of whom were appointed to protect the whole Nation, and others to watch over the welfare of particular persons: One of these indeed, they looked upon as superior to the rest in authority, because as a national Guardian, they thought his commission more honourable and extensive; but they reckoned all alike, as the *works of God's hand*, temporary, finite, created Beings.

The modern *Jews* are so far from supposing the *Angel of God's presence* to be the second essence in the Godhead, that they interpret every action, ascribed to an *Angel*, in the english translation of the History, of an human messenger employed by God, such as *Joshua* was, either to conduct the *Israelites* in the right way to the promised land, or to fight for them against those enemies, who obstructed their passage to it. And that Christians might not injuriously confound the nature of Angels with the nature of the second person in the holy Trinity, St. *Paul* has pointed out the difference between them, upon the testimony of God himself, in this very respect of Dominion and delegated

delegated power : *Of the Angels he saith, who maketh his Angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But unto the Son he saith, thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. And again, to which of the Angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Heb. i. 7, 8, 13.*

St. Paul indeed has always given the same Titles and Attributes to the Son of God, as he gives to God the Father ; sometimes calling him *God over all, blessed for evermore*, and at others, *the Lord of Glory, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords* ; unless therefore we can suppose that Divinity will admit of different degrees of perfection, (which is to suppose that what is absolutely perfect may have some imperfections belonging to it,) we must conclude, that the Apostle meant to deliver the same doctrine, which has been since advanced and maintained in the Church, “ that the Godhead of the Father and of the Son is all one, the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal.”

But although we find this doctrine established in the antient Creed, yet we are told by our author, that “ if we consult the opinions “ of the Fathers upon this subject, for the first “ three hundred years after Christ, we shall “ find them all universally agreeing in the contrary doctrine.” And accordingly, he mentions

tions the names of several of the most antient writers, (a list, borrowed from Dr. Cudworth's *Intellect. Syst.* p. 595. "out of which, he says, it seems needless to produce any Quotations." p. 115. It would indeed have been imprudent upon his scheme, to produce them, for, unluckily for him, most of the authors, which he names, have passages in them, which destroy his whole opinion, and have been produced by others as the best proofs on the opposite side of the Question. For example; *Justin Martyr*, who lived within 40 or 50 years of *St. John*, has professed his belief of the *consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father. In his Dialogue with *Trypho* the Jew he condemns the blindness of those Jews, who denied that *Christ was God*, as being the Son of the only, unbegotten, and incomprehensible God*. And in another part of the same work, he explains the manner of Christ's generation, by observing, that it was not by any actual separation, as if the essence of the Godhead were divided; but he arose from his substance, as perfectly the same, as one fire kindles many fires, without any diminution in itself, or difference in the others. p. 358. Upon which

* Εἰ νοεήκατε τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν, ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐξεργείσθη αὐτὸν εἶναι θεόν, τῷ μόνῳ καὶ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ ἀρρήτῳ θεῷ υἱόν. p. 355.

Bishop Bull remarks, *Quorsum verò illud spectat, si Filius in generatione suâ cum Patris substantiâ nihil quicquam commune habeat? Deinde simile, quò hâc Catholicam doctrinam illustrat Justinus, τὸ ὁμοούσιον, Filii manifestè comprobatur.*—Quis non fatebitur, ignem ab alio igne accensum ejusdem cum ipso naturæ ac substantiæ esse?—And again, after quoting a passage from Tatian, Justin's Disciple, of the same import, he observes, *Ex his verò clarè efficitur, doctrinam, de Filii τῷ ὁμοούσιῳ, sive ex ipsâ Patris essentiâ ac substantiâ productione, dogma fuisse Justinæ ætate in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ receptum, fixum, ratum ac stabilitum. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 2.*

Athenagoras says expressly that the *Word* is the Son of God in Idea and Energy, for all things were made by him and thro' him; that the Father and the Son are *One*, the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, by an unity of Nature. Agreeably to which, *Tertulian* observes, that the Son, who was begotten before all things, can be derived from no other cause, but from the substance of the Father, in the unity of which substance they are *one* God, even as the Sun and its rays are one Sun. And He also explains the generation and ὁμοούσιον of the Son by the same illustrations, which *Justin Martyr* and *Athenagoras* had used. (*Vid. Apologet. c. 21. & lib. adv. Prax.*

Prax. c. 13. & contr. Marc. lib. 3. cap. 6.) Clemens of Alexandria is very explicit in this point ; he observes that the Son was the first, and before all ages, the perfect resemblance of the invisible God, and equal to the Lord of all things, because he is his Son *, which expressions led Ruffinus to bear this testimony of him, *Clemens Alexandrinus Presbyter & Magister Ecclesiæ illius, in omnibus pænè libris suis, Trinitatis gloriam & æternitatem unam eandemque designat, Ruff. de adulter. lib. Origen.*—Two Fathers, which our author mentions, Origen, and Dionysius, have used even the Term of the Nicene Council. Origen says, that the Son, who was begotten of his Father, without beginning, and from all eternity, is of the same Nature and Substance with him, as a vapour is consubstantial with that body, from whence it arose. Upon which account Athanasius commends his orthodoxy in this point, as being of the same opinion with the Nicene Council, *περὶ τῆ αἰδιότητος συν- εἶναι τὸν λόγον τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ μὴ ἑτέρας ὑσίας ἢ ὑποστάσεως, (Athan. op. tom. 1. p. 277. Syn. Nic. contr. Arian. Decret.)* And Dionysius of Alexandria observes, that in this Divine Genera-

* Ὁ Θεῖον λόγος, ὁ φανερώτατος ὅλως Θεός, ὁ τῷ δεσπότῃ τῶν ὅλων ἐξισωθείς ὅτι ἦν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. Protreptic. five Admonit. ad Gentes. p. 68.

tion, the Father and Son are *consubstantial*, partaking of the same Nature, as Father and Son do in an human birth. And in a letter to *Dionysius* the Roman *Pontifex*, which *Athanasius* cites at large, he afterwards defends himself against the objections of those, who falsely accused him, ὡς ἔλεγοντος τὸν χριστὸν ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ θεῷ: εἰ γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα τὸτό φημι μὴ εὐρηκέναι, μηδ' ἀνεγνωκέναι πρὸ τῶν ἀγίων γραφῶν· ἀλλά γε τὰ ἐπιχειρήματα μὴ τὰ ἐξ ἧς ἀσσειώπηκασι, τῆς διανοίας ταύτης ἐκ ἀπάδει. *Vid. plur. ap. Athan. De Dionys. sentent. con. Arian. p. 561.*

How unjustly then does our author affirm in the gross, that the Fathers of the three first Centuries condemn the equality of the Son with the Father? whereas this opinion was evidently maintained in every age, and the later writers always commend the foregoing ones for having maintained it. But it seems some modern Advocates of Christianity have given up this point, and that “ because the fragrancy of the Truth obliged
“ them to it: and these are, the judicious
“ *Mr. Chillingworth*, the learned Bishop *Bull*,
“ and the discerning Dr. *Cudworth*. The
“ opinion of *Mr. Chillingworth* is to be
“ found in a Letter of his to a friend, who
“ desired to know what judgment might be
“ made of *Arianism*, from the sense of Antiquity.

“ tiquity. In answer to which Mr. Chillingworth wrote the following letter: ‘ I was mistaken in my directing you to *Eusebius* for the matter you wott of. You shall find it in a witness much farther from exception here-in than *Eusebius*; even *Athanasius* himself, the greatest Adversary of that doctrine: See the *Ep. de Synod. Arim. & Seleuc.* p. 917. where he says, that the eighty Fathers, which condemned *Samosatenus*, affirmed expressly,—*That the Son is not of the same essence of the Father.* Which is to contradict formally the Council of Nice, which decreed *the Son co-essential to the Father.*” p. 115, 116. See Mr. Chillingworth’s Life, written by *Des Maizeaux.* p. 51.

But what an unfair account is this of *Athanasius*’s judgment in this particular? for so far is he from affirming that those eighty Fathers were of this opinion, that he disapproves even of the suspicion of their having advanced it; but rather imagines that the *Nicene* Fathers followed their opinion in settling the Terms of that Council: and intimates very strongly, that this accusation of the seventy Fathers, (he mentions no more) who deposed *Samosatenus* was equally false with that of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, before-mentioned, (p. 80.) who lived long before the time of those Fathers,

thers, and abhorred the thoughts of being accused of maintaining, that the Son was not co-essential with the Father. But we may go still further: six of those Bishops, before they publicly sat in judgment upon the Heretic, wrote to him upon this subject; and affirm it to be the true Apostolic Faith, which had been constantly received in the Church, that the Son of God was truly God, ἡ περὶ οὐκ ἴσκει, ἀλλ' ἰσὶα καὶ ὑποστάσει Θεόν, both in substance and essence. *Bibl. Patrum*. Tom. 11. What can be plainer then, than that the sense of Antiquity condemns the doctrine, which our author, upon the strength of Mr. *Chillingworth's* great character, endeavours to establish? but that learned man had not sufficiently considered the matter, before he attempts to direct his friend in the truth of it.

Bishop *Bull* indeed observes, “ That *Origen* sometimes speaks otherwise, in his manner of explaining the Article of Faith concerning the Trinity, than the Catholics do now-a-days, which, he adds, is no more than almost all the Fathers did who lived before the Council of Nice.” p. 120. But the same very learned author, in the former part of the same chapter, declares of *Origen*, that he expressly pronounces against *Arius*, that the Son of God was ἡ δὲ ποιητὴν, ἡ δὲ κτιστὸν,
as

as if he had sat in the Council of the Nicene Fathers. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. c. 9. Sect. 2. § 9. It is plain from hence, that Bishop Bull looked upon *Origen* as an opposer of that Doctrine, which the *Nicene* Synod was afterwards convened to condemn; only, he sometimes makes use of different Terms, tho' of the same import, to express the same thing.

The last modern authority is Dr. *Cudworth*, who says, "that *Athanasius's* appeal to the
 " testimony of *Origen* was only for the Eter-
 " nity and Divinity of the Son of God, but not
 " at all for such an absolute co-equality of
 " him with the Father, as would exclude all
 " dependence, subordination, and inferiori-
 " ty." *Intell. Syst.* p. 595. *ap. Essay.* p. 120,
 121. But *Athanasius* plainly meant more than this by his recommendation of *Origen*. He expressly says, that *Origen* had advanced the sentiments, which the *Nicene* Synod confirmed, in relation to the *same essence and substance* of the Father and the Son; and if of the same essence, they must be *co-eternal together and co-equal*. I have occasionally quoted this passage from *Athanasius* before, p. 79. and therefore I shall add no more to confute Dr. *Cudworth's* interpretation of it; only, that what is true of the Son is equally true of the Holy Ghost. *St. Cyril*, as our author quotes him,

p. 134. has set this matter in its proper light, “ by accommodating the right notion of *Consubstantiality* to the three *Hypostases*, so that there may be but *one* specific nature or essence of the Godhead, not distinguishable by any natural diversity, and so no one *Hypostasis* any way inferior or subordinate to another.”

But because St. *Cyril* lived about one hundred years after the Council of *Nice*, therefore our author looks upon the doctrine of the *three Hypostases*, mentioned by that Father, as a novel doctrine, “ that it was not the doctrine of the Council of *Nice*, but was the doctrine of the *Arians*, as well as of the *Platonists*.” p. 135. The former part of this assertion is contradicted by the Writers of that Age, and the latter part (*viz.* that it was the doctrine of the *Arians*) is an equivocation.——*Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, who was present at the Council of *Nice*, confesses in his letters to *Eustathius*, that the Son has the proper *Hypostasis* and subsistence of God, and that God is *one* in *three Hypostases* *; in this, the Historian says, the two Antagonists, *Eusebius* and *Eustathius* agreed, however they differed in other points. And *Anastadius* also bears witness, that the *Ni-*

* Ἐνυπόστατον τε καὶ ἐνυπάρχοντα τὸν υἱὸν εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ, εἶνα τε Θεὸν ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν εἶναι. *Socr. Ecc. Hist. Lib. 1. c. 23.*

cene Fathers decreed, that there are *three Hypostases* or persons in the Holy and *consubstantial* Trinity †. That the *Arians* also held the *three Hypostases* is in some measure true; but it was in a very different sense from that of the *Nicene* Fathers: for those Heretics are condemned by the Writers of that Age, not for maintaining the three *Hypostases*, but because they cut the Godhead, as it were, εἰς τρεῖς μεμερισμένας ὑποστάσεις, into three *divided Hypostases*, as *Athanasius* speaks. p. 275. Bishop *Bull* cites the authority of the two *Dionysiuses* upon this occasion, who were both engaged in the defence of the Catholic Faith against Heretics: His words are, *Nimirum uterque hypostaseōn distinctionem in Divinitate pariter agnovit; uterque divisionem & separationem Hypostaseōn pariter negavit*. After which he quotes a passage from *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* ||, and concludes from it, *Quibus ex verbis aperte colligitur, apud Catholicos Dionysii ætate ratum & fixum illud fuisse, tres esse in Divinis Hypostases; Sabellianos verò ex illâ hypothese consequi existimâsse, tres esse Hypostases divisas;*

† Τρεῖς εἶναι ὑποστάσεις, ἥτοι πρόσωπα ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγίας καὶ ὁμοουσίας τριάδος. *Anas.* in Ὁδηγ. c. 21.

|| In his apology against the *Sabellians* εἰ τῷ τρεῖς εἶναι τὰς ὑποστάσεις, μεμερισμένας εἶναι λέγουσι, τρεῖς εἰσι, καὶ μὴ θείωσιν, ἢ τὴν θείαν τριάδα παντελῶς ἀνελέτωσαν.

utpote qui tres distinctas personas in essentiâ Divinâ absque divisione subsistentes mente suâ concipere nequiverunt. Hanc autem consequentiam omninò rejiciunt ambo Dionysii in locis suprâ adductis. Bull Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 2. c. 9.

But from this mistaken notion our author would infer, “ that the Creed, which goes
 “ under the name of *Athanasius*, could not possibly have been written by him, because he,
 “ as well as the *Nicene* Fathers, insisted upon it, that there was but one *Hypostasis* in
 “ the Trinity, any more than one *Usia*, since
 “ they supposed those two words to mean
 “ one and the same thing. To say therefore that the three persons in the Trinity
 “ are one *Usia* and three *Hypostases*, is the
 “ same thing as to say, that they are one substance and three substances at the same time,
 “ which I take to be a contradiction in terms,
 “ and therefore cannot be affirmed even of
 “ God himself.” p. 135, 136. To all which I answer—The *Nicene* Council was convened in order to confute the opinions of two different Sects, the one of which *confounded the persons* of the Trinity, and the other *divided their substances* or nature. In opposition to the former, the Fathers decreed *three Hypostases*, and to confute the latter, they determined, that those *Hypostases* formed but *one indivisible*

visible Usia or substance. They therefore put nearly the same meaning upon the two words, but made use of them both in order to guard against the different Heresies of those, who denied that the Son was of the *Usia* of the Father, and of those, who maintained that the Son was not of the Father's *Usia*, but of another *Hypostasis* *. How the whole Decree of *three Hypostases* and *one Usia* may in this sense be made consistent with itself, is clearly taught us by St. Paul: *the body is not one member, but many. And if they were all one member, where were the body? but now are they many members, yet but one body.* 1 Cor. xii. 14—20. The Godhead, in like manner, is not one *Hypostasis* or subsistence, but three: and if they were all one *Hypostasis*, where were the Father that created, the Son that redeemed, and the Holy Ghost that sanctifies us? but now are they three *Hypostases* or subsistences, yet but one *Usia* or essence, all perfect, and equal in all. It is therefore too hastily asserted, that *Athanasius* insists upon one *Hypostasis* in the Trinity,

* This is St. Basil's account of the Council — ὡς τῶν μὲν ἀρνημένων τὸ ἐκ τῆς ὑσίας εἶναι τῷ πατρὶ, τῶν δὲ λεγόντων, ὅτε ἐκ τῆς ὑσίας, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἄλλης τινὸς ὑποστάσεως, ὅτως (i. e. by making use of both those words ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ ὑσίας) ἀμφοτέρω ὡς ἀλλότρια τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ φρονήματι ἀπηγόρευσαν. Basil. Ep. 78.

because

because he makes that word and *Ufia* to signify the same thing: they were so far distinguished from each other, as to admit of different characters in the Godhead; and yet so far synonymous, as to make those characters to be *ἀμούσσιοι*. This construction of the words is a proof that the Creed was *Athanasius's*, since the same doctrine is advanced in that, as we find in those works, which are confessedly his; “there is one person, or *Hypostasis* of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost; but the Godhead, or *Ufia*, of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one:” which sentences are plainly levelled against the two parties in the foregoing one, against whom also the *Nicene* Council sat, *viz.* the *Sabellians*, who confounded the persons, and the *Arians*, who divided the substances.

Our author has added a note to page 135, which contains a quotation from *Athanasius*, in confirmation of what he delivers about the use of those two words, “where that Father “positively asserts: *ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις ἑστία ἐστὶ, καὶ ἑδὲν ἄλλο σημαίνον ἐχει.*” Here he stops, as if it were the end of the sentence, whereas the author goes on, *ἡ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν.* It signifies nothing else—unless *self-existence*. And therefore when applied to the Trinity, we ought

ought to take in the whole meaning of the primitive Father. Now that may easily be collected from his writings. In his *third Dialogue upon the Trinity*. Vol. 2. p. 223. he says, in the character of the *orthodox*, that when the word *Hypostasis* is ascribed to the Deity, the different *Hypostasis* ought to be distinguished, the Son, having some things, as incarnation for example, peculiar to himself, not as, separated from the *Hypostasis* of the Father, but still as being in him. When he explains the word therefore by *εἰς* or *ὑπάρξις*, as he does in the place our author quotes, it is plain, by a comparison of these passages, that he thought the different *offices* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in relation to us and our Redemption, denoted the different *Hypostasis*, but that in these several offices, they still retained the *τὸ ὄν*, the peculiar properties of the Godhead, *Self-existence* and *Eternity*. Thus far *Hypostasis* and *Ufia* were co-incident.

In this two-fold acceptation of the word, the Apostle calls *Jesus Christ* the *express image of his (God's) person*, *χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*: this Similitude or *Hypostasis* consisted, as the following words explain it, in *upholding all things by the word of his power*; and this power denoted the *τὸ ὄν*, or infinity of him that could exert it, which could be derived
from

from nothing less than Divinity itself. *Irenæus* therefore was greatly mistaken in saying, "that this word was a barbarous word;" (*Essay*, p. 136.) It was evidently used by *St. Paul* in the sense that we now understand it, to signify the essence of the Son, as founded in the eternal essence of the Father.

And according to this two-fold acceptation of the word, we stand clear also of the absurdity, to which our author would reduce us, viz. "that to say, that the three persons in the Trinity are *one Usia* and *three Hypostases*, is the same thing, as to say, that they are *one Substance* and *three Substances at the same time.*" p. 136. For with respect to their Divinity, or *Usia*, it is one and the same in all; the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God: but with regard to the difference of their relations to us, the *Hypostasis* of the Father consists in creating, the *Hypostasis* of the Son, in redeeming, and the *Hypostasis* of the Holy Ghost, in sanctifying us: each of these offices requires Divinity in the person that is employed in it, and yet this Divinity, tho' alike in all, must be distinguished by us, in order to point out the true nature of the whole Godhead. The plurality of the *Hypostases* therefore must center in one essence, or *Usia*; only that essence

is

is distinguishable, in a personal capacity, by relative Denominations; which no more make them three substances, than (according to the common similitude among the Antients to illustrate this great mystery) the several members of the body, which have separate offices, can be called several bodies.

Upon this absurdity however our author advances forward to give the reason of it: "for when it is said, in the *Nicene Creed*, that "the Son is ἐκ τῆς ὑσίας τῷ πατρὶ, *of the substance of the Father*, and that he is ὁμοῦσις τῷ πατρὶ, *of one Substance with the Father*, "it is not meant thereby that he is of one "and the same kind of substance with the "Father, but that he is actually one and the "same *undivided* substance with the Father."

p. 137. What the true meaning of the expression is will be best collected from those ancient authors, who first used it, and that, we shall find to be, in a true Catholic sense, an *unity in essence* of the Father and the Son. Thus, *Eusebius* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, confesses, ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν λογίς τινὰς, καὶ ἐπιφανείς ἐπισκόπους, καὶ συγγραφείας ἔγνωμεν, ἐπὶ τῆς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ θεολογίας τῷ τῷ ὁμοῦσίς συχρησαμένους ὀνόματι. (See *Bp. Pearson* on the *Creed*, p. 135. Not.) When we say therefore that the Father and Son are *one*, we do not mean to

take

take away the distinction of their persons, but speak only of a perfect identity of their essence: we ought not to *confound the persons*, and yet we cannot *divide the Godhead*.

But even the word *person* gives occasion to our author to doubt the possibility of this Doctrine of the Trinity: and he has the greater objection to it, because “ we have followed, “ he says, the Church of *Rome* in rendering “ the word *ὑπόστασις* by the English word *person*, that Church having rendered it by the “ Latin word *persona*.” p. 138. Had our author searched far enough into this matter, he would have found this interpretation of the word to be much older than he now imagines: it was as early as *Tertullian’s* time, who often makes use of it in his book *advers. Prax.* and at the same time asserts the distinction of persons in the Father and Son, whilst he establishes the subsistence of the Son in the *Unity* of the Divine essence. Dean *Swift’s* observation upon the opposers of the Doctrine of the Trinity, is very just and pious: “ they proceed wholly upon a mistake: they would shew how impossible it is that *three* can be *one*, and *one* can be *three*; whereas the Scripture saith no such thing, at least in that manner they would make it: But only that there is some kind of *Unity* and *Distinction* in the
Divine

Divine Nature, which Mankind cannot possibly comprehend. Thus the whole Doctrine is short and plain, and in itself incapable of any controversy; since God himself hath pronounced the fact, but wholly concealed the manner." *Serm. on the Trinity.*

The very Terms however, in which the Scriptures have delivered this Doctrine to our Faith, have been the *occasion of stumbling* to the adversaries of it: "for tho' the relation
" between two co-equal Beings might bear
" some analogy to the denomination of *Bro-*
" *thers*; yet it seems absolutely inconsistent
" with that of Father and Son." p. 141, 142. But to this I answer, These Terms are used in Scripture to accommodate the Mystery, in some measure, to our apprehension; but as all Divine productions, together with the relations founded thereon, are quite different from the Human, so we may reasonably conclude, that the communication of the Divine essence, thus expressed, is such, as may properly denote him the *ONLY begotten Son of God*. We are assured, that *the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth in him bodily*, and more than this the Father cannot have: but yet in that perfect and absolute equality, there is nevertheless this disparity, that God the Father hath that essence of himself, whereas Christ has the same indivisible essence
by

by a complete communication from him. If any man would go further than this, or is desirous of raising objections, or throwing difficulties in our way, we need only answer him by the question of the Prophet, *Who shall declare his Generation?* the sublime and peculiar manner of it. Only, thus much we may affirm, that as the Divine essence is communicated to the Son, so every essential property belonging to it must be communicated also: the Divine Nature is indivisible as it is incorporeal; the Father is in Christ, and Christ in him; they are therefore (notwithstanding this relation of order) in duration and dignity, co-eternal together and co-equal.

The *Nicene* Bishops asserted the *consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father, and decreed *Anathemas* against all those Heretics, who maintained, “that the Son existed out
“ of any other Hypostasis or *Ufia*, than
“ the Father. Now, says our author, from
“ hence it may be observed in the first place,
“ that these Fathers understood the words
“ *Ufia* and *Hypostasis* in the same sense, so as
“ to mean one and the same thing; and that
“ as the Son was of the same undivided, or
“ individual *Ufia*, so was he also in the same
“ undivided, or individual *Hypostasis* with the
“ Father. And possibly this may be the rea-
“ son,

“ son, why these Anathemas are omitted
 “ out of our present Nicene Creed ; be-
 “ cause they contradict in Terms the *Athana-*
 “ *sian* Creed, which asserts, that there is one
 “ *Hypostasis* of the Father, and another of the
 “ the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit.”

p. 143.

Answer——The construction, which the Writers of that Age put upon these two words ; how far they were synonymous ; and wherein they were different, has been considered already : p. 87, &c. And by the help of those observations, we may reconcile the Doctrines of the two Creeds. For if *Ufia* and *Hypostasis* were understood to denote the peculiar essence of the *eternal* Godhead, then they might be looked upon as one and the same, in signification, by those who asserted the *eternity* of the Son : and if the word *Hypostasis* were also considered in another light, as relating to the scheme and parts of man's Redemption, which no power, less than a Divine, could accomplish, then the same asserters of Christ's Divinity, might, consistently with themselves, distinguish the *Hypostases* of the workers of this Redemption, whilst they founded them all upon that unity of *Ufia* or essence, which each of them, in their several *Hypostases*, fully and equally enjoyed. It is not

H

therefore

therefore “ so odd, as our author cannot help
“ saying it is, to have these two Creeds esta-
“ blished in the same Church :” p. 146. the
compilers of them were of the same opinion,
and only expressed themselves differently up-
on this point, to answer the Heresies of two
different parties, which then divided the true
Faith of the Church. And as to the objec-
tion of “ this metaphysical dispute being
“ made a part of the public service of the
“ Church, which is an assembly composed,
“ not only of quick-sighted Philosophers, but
“ of the lowest of the people, who are re-
“ quired there to give their assent to these e-
“ quivocal, if not contradictory Interpretations
“ of Scripture.” p. 152. As to this objection,
I say, it will avail nothing against the use of
these Creeds; since the bulk of Mankind is
obliged to believe no more than the plain Scrip-
ture-doctrine of this great article of Faith.
The damnatory clauses in the *Athanasian*
Creed do not extend to every minute particu-
lar contained in it; they are only pointed a-
gainst those, who deny the substance of the
Christian Faith, and particularly, those Scrip-
ture-truths of a Trinity in Unity, and the In-
carnation, Death, and Resurrection of our Lord
and Saviour *Jesus Christ*. In this light there-
fore, these condemning sentences are nothing
more

more than the threatning of *Christ* himself denounced against the Infidel, *He that believeth not, shall be damned.* Mark xvi. 16.

I cannot leave this subject without taking notice of one passage more, where our author puts the doctrines of *Consubstantiation* and *Transubstantiation* upon the same footing, although he must acknowledge this difference, that in the latter our Senses are contradicted as well as our Reason; whereas in the former, the utmost that can be said against it is, that in a great measure, it exceeds the capacity of our Reason: but this ought no more to be considered, as an argument of our disbelief, than our utter ignorance of the *manner*, in which the human soul and body are united, should lead us to deny the *possibility* of such an union.

He observes, p. 151. " That the Doctrine
" of the Trinity is as certainly revealed in the
" 19th verse of the 28th chapter of St. *Mat-*
" *thew*, as the doctrine of the *Euchrist* is, in
" the 26th verse of the 24th chapter of the
" same Evangelist: but the Scriptures are as
" silent about the *Consubstantiality* of the one,
" as about the *Transubstantiation* of the other."

The very word indeed is not to be found in the Scriptures, but our Saviour has delivered the doctrine as strongly as can well be expressed: thus, *John* x. 30. *I and my Father*

are ONE: and in another place, *the Father is in me, and I in him*: which expressions conveyed such clear ideas of an equal Divinity to the Jews, that they took up stones to stone him, for speaking blasphemy, and because he made himself God.

These Scripture-declarations are so evidently contrary to all that our author has advanced on this important subject, that nothing more is necessary to be added to explain their sense, or confirm the doctrine contained in them. He may, in his own mind, be master of all that ingenuity of establishing or retracting his opinion upon conviction, to which he lays claim: but I cannot help thinking, that if he can resist the evidence of these divine Truths, as they stand in the Gospel, explanations of them may more openly confute, but they will never convince him.

APPENDIX.

WHILE the foregoing sheets were in the Press, another Pamphlet, written by the same author, came to hand, intitled, *A Vindication of the Histories of the old and new Testament; In Answer to Lord Bolingbroke*. I venture to say, they were both written by the same author, from two passages, in particular, in the *Vindication*, which evidently favour the principles advanced in the *Essay*. Indeed, the learned Prelate himself endeavours to confirm the world in the truth of this opinion, by going out of his way, as it were, on purpose to cast a reflection upon the character of his great enemy *Athanasius*, which had not the least relation to the matter, of which he was treating. p. 51. He allows, with Lord *Bolingbroke*, that “ the charge of corrupting History, in the
“ cause of Religion, has been committed to the
“ most famous Champions, and greatest Saints
“ of the Church :” and he allows it for no other reason; but that the concession might give him an opportunity of applying this general accusation to a particular case; and that he might be led from thence to make a distinction between those Holy men, deservedly called *Saints*, “ who would
“ have suffered death rather than corrupt History ;” and those, “ who have been canonized for Saints
“ by the Church of *Rome*, for having been champions for the Pope of *Rome*, such as *Athana-*
“ *sus*

“*sus* and others, who have shamefully corrupted History.” But what reason for this insinuation could our author gather from any part of *Athanasius*’s conduct? All accounts of that agree in the great sufferings he underwent for his zealous defence of the true faith of Christ against the corruptions of Heretics and Impostors. Take this account, in particular, from the learned *Hooker*, and you will not imagine, that he ever received the least favour, either of protection or canonization from the Empire or See of *Rome*. “*Athanasius*, says he, by the space of 46 years, from the time of his consecration to succeed *Alexander* Archbishop in the Church of *Alexandria* ’till the last hour of his life in this world, never enjoyed the comfort of a peacable day. The heart of *Constantine* stolen from him. *Constantius*, *Constantine*’s Successor, his Scourge and Torment by all the ways that malice armed with sovereign authority could devise and use. Under *Julian* no rest given him: and in the days of *Valentinian* as little.” (*Eccles. Pol. B. 5.*) Add to this, that Pope *Liberius* justified the condemnation which the Eastern Bishops had passed upon *Athanasius*; excluded him from the communion of the Church; rejected him as a cheat and an impostor; and promised his Brethren of the East, to join with them in breaking off all communication with him for the future. And is it likely, that after all this, the same Church should canonize him as one of their Champions; or indeed, that they should ever countenance a man, whose courage none of their dangers or troubles

troubles could daunt, but continued stedfast in his first professions of the Catholic Faith, when the united strength almost of the whole world besides opposed him? This, if any, is the holy man, "who would have suffered death rather than corrupt History:" and who would, in all probability, have escaped the censure of our author, if the Creed, which goes under his name, had not been received in our Church.

The other passage in the *Vindication*, which I hinted at, is in *page* 80. where the author, among many very good and just observations on the validity of the Scripture-History, has dropped one upon St. *John's* manner of writing, perfectly similar to the sentiments of the *Essay*. "St. *John*, he says, enters into the more mysterious and recondite part of our Saviour's life and character: but then, he is more explicit than all the rest of the Evangelists, in asserting the dependency of the Son on God the Father; both before he took human Nature upon himself and afterwards." But this surely is delivered at large without attending well to the immediate scope of St. *John's* argument: for whoever looks into his Gospel must discover his opinion concerning the equality of God the Son with God the Father, before his incarnation, as well as his inferiority to the Father after it. He begins with a direct affirmation of Christ's Divinity, *chap. i. ver. 1. The Word was God*; which bespeaks his independency, as it implies absolute perfection. He goes on, *ver. 2.* with regard to our Saviour's Divine Nature, *all things*

things were made by him; a proof therefore of his *Omnipotence*, since nothing less than Almighty Power could create a World: and again, in the next chapter, *ver. 25. He knew what was in man*; a characteristic of God, denoting *Omniscience*, since nothing less than infinite Knowledge can *search the hearts*, and *try the reins* of men.

I do not mean by these short observations to depreciate the merits of the Bishop's *Vindication*; He has sufficiently shewn his great skill in Scripture-Chronology; and has traced out the Canon of the Scripture-History with ingenuity and exactness: but the first part of these remarks I thought due to the memory of the primitive Saint; and the latter part I believe to be the doctrine of Christ and his beloved Disciple.



ERRATA.

- Page 23. lin. 7 for ἀιδέμενος read ἀιδέμενος.
 29. lin. 8. for Omnipresence, read Omnipotence.
 33. lin. 22. for *but this*, read *but that this*.
 39. lin. 4. for *obliged*, read *obeyed*.
 56. lin. 19. for *grant*, read *granted*.
 66. lin. 20. after *Messiah*, add ;
 83. lin. 4. for *in one*, read *none*.
 85. lin. 15. for *to*, read *of*.
 97. lin. 2. for *in* read *on*.
 116. lin. antepenult. for θεῶν, read θεός.
 107. lin. 7. for *Hypostasis*, read *Hyposteses*.

